EDUCATIONAL
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE OF
BRITISH COLUMBIA

Report No. 83:7

A SURVEY OF MODERATELY RETARDED ADULTS IN THE LOWER MAINLAND OF BRITISH COLUMBIA: THEIR COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT ONE AND THREE YEARS AFTER GRADUATING FROM SCHOOL

M. Enkin

REPORTS

REPORT NO.: 83:7

TITLE: A SURVEY OF MODERATELY RETARDED ADULTS IN THE LOWER MAINLAND OF BRITISH COLUMBIA: THEIR COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT ONE AND THREE YEARS AFTER GRADUATING FROM SCHOOL

GRANT NO.: DG 325

AUTHOR(S): M. Enkin

PROJECT DIRECTOR: (if different from author)

PROJECT SITE OR SAMPLE:

The report is based on a study or project funded by the ERIBC Grants Program. The report may be reproduced in whole or in part, but the author(s) and ERIBC must be credited.

ERIBC takes no responsibility for the work as it was carried out, or the conclusions drawn by the author(s).

This report is available on a loan basis (in B.C. only) or a purchase basis at the cost of $26.50 from the,

EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
Suite 400 - 515 West 10th Avenue
Vancouver, B.C. V5Z 4A8

Telephone: 873-3801

A SURVEY OF MODERATELY RETARDED ADULTS IN THE LOWER MAINLAND OF BRITISH COLUMBIA: THEIR COMMUNITY ADJUSTMENT ONE AND THREE YEARS AFTER GRADUATING FROM SCHOOL

by

MARVIN I. ENKIN

B.A., Sir George Williams University, 1970

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF

THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Department of Educational Psychology
and Special Education)

We accept this thesis as conforming

to the required standard

.....

.....

.....

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April, 1983

© Marvin I. Enkin, 1983

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe the community adjustment of moderately retarded adults living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, one and three years after they graduated from school. Community adjustment was considered in terms of the moderately retarded adults' mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status.

Based on the research conducted by Lambert (1976) an interview-prompt recording sheet was developed, pilot tested, refined, and then used to gather data on the community adjustment of an accessible sample of moderately retarded adults in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. Twenty-three adults (13 males and ten females) who graduated from school in 1978 and 20 adults (nine males and 11 females) who graduated from school in 1980 were interviewed.

A 2x2 (year-by-gender) chi-square analysis was used to examine the frequency distributions for males and females from each of 1978 and 1980. The results revealed that for each component of community adjustment the distributions for males and females within and between 1978 and 1980 were not significantly different ($p<.05$).

Implications for personnel who work with the moderately retarded while they attend school and after they graduate from school have been outlined; as well, suggestions for future research have been made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ii

LIST OF TABLES vi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ix

Chapter 1 1

THE PROBLEM 1

Background Of The Problem 1

Purpose Of The Study 10

Description Of Components Of Community Adjustment ... 10

Other Terms And Issues 12

Research Questions And Hypotheses 14

Organization Of The Thesis 15

Chapter 2 16

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 16

Studies On Institutional Populations 16

Studies On Non-Institutional Populations 23

Summary And Implications For The Present Study 36

Chapter 3 38

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT 38

Draft I 39

Pilot Study 44

Chapter 4 47

METHODOLOGY 47

Population 47

Identification And Selection Of Subjects 48

Data Collection Procedures 50

Data Analysis Procedures 52
Chapter 5 54
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 54
Demographic Description 55
Mobility Independence 70
Self-Sufficiency 77
Interaction Level 101
Vocational Ability 120
Educational Status 135
Chapter 6 142
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 142
Summary Of The Study 142
Conclusions Of The Study 143
Implications Of The Study 153
Limitations Of The Study 155
Recommendations For Future Research 156
REFERENCES 157
APPENDIX A
Questionnaire Used By Lambert 164
APPENDIX B
Introductory Remarks And Explanation Of Interview
Interview-Prompt Recording Sheet Used In Pilot Study ...186
APPENDIX C
Interview-Prompt Recording Sheet Used In Main Study 211
APPENDIX D
Letters And Supporting Documents Sent To
School Districts And Associations For The

Mentally Handicapped 236

APPENDIX E

Letters And Consent Forms Sent To Subjects 244

APPENDIX F

Coding Of Responses 250

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1
Response Rate, 1978 55
Table 2
Response Rate, 1980 56
Table 3
Dominant Source Of Information, Gender By Year 57
Table 4
Frequencies And Percentages, Gender By Year 58
Table 5
Age Distribution, Gender By Year 59
Table 6
Age At Graduation, Gender By Year 60
Table 7
School Of Graduation, Gender By Year 61
Table 8
Number Of Years In School Of Graduation, Gender By Year 62
Table 9
Number Of Years In Other Schools, Gender By Year 63
Table 10
Location Of Residence, Gender By Year 64
Table 11
Frequency And Percentage Of Living Arrangements, 1978 .. 66
Table 12
Frequency And Percentage Of Living Arrangements, 1980 .. 67
Table 13
Years In Living Arrangement, Gender By Year 68
Table 14
Mean Years In Living Arrangement, Gender By Year 69
Table 15
Form Of Transportation And Frequency Of Use, 1978 71
Table 16
Form Of Transportation And Frequency Of Use, 1980 71
Table 17
Levels Of Supervision On Transportation, Gender By Year 75
Table 18
Frequencies And Percentages Of Subjects Cooking Meals, Gender By Year 78
Table 19
Skill Level Used In Preparation Of Meals, 1978 80
Table 20
Skill Level Used In Preparation Of Meals, 1980 81
Table 21
Persons Who Cooked For Subjects, Gender By Year 83
Table 22
Type Of Subjects' Help In Making Meals, Gender By Year . 84
Table 23
Frequencies And Percentages Of Subjects Doing Home Management Tasks, Gender By Year 85
Table 24
Types Of Home Management Tasks And Frequency Of Being Done, 1978 86
Table 25

Types Of Home Management Tasks And Frequency Of Being Done, 1980 86
Table 26
Subjects Knowing How To Do Home Management Tasks, Gender By Year 89
Table 27
Persons Who Did Home Management Tasks For Subjects, Gender By Year 90
Table 28
Frequency And Percentage Of Source Of Income, Gender By Year 91
Table 29
What Money Was Saved For, Gender By Year 93
Table 30
Expenses Paid For, 1978 95
Table 31
Expenses Paid For, 1980 95
Table 32
Control Of Spending Money, Gender By Year 97
Table 33
Activities Participated In 102
Table 34
Reasons For Subjects Living With Their Parents, Gender By Year 105
Table 35
Type Of Help Needed For Subjects Living With Parents, Gender By Year 106
Table 36
Reasons For Not Living With Parents, Gender By Year 108
Table 37
Interactions Of Subjects And Parents For Subjects Not Living With Parents, Gender By Year 109
Table 38
Type And Source Of Help For Subjects Not Living With Parents, Gender By Year 111
Table 39
Interactions Of Subjects With Other Relatives, Gender By Year 113
Table 40
Subjects Having Boy/Girl Friends And Where They Met, Gender By Year 114
Table 41
Subjects Having Good Friends And Where They Met, Gender By Year 117
Table 42
Present Vocational Ability Of Students, 1978 122
Table 43
Present Vocational Ability Of Students, 1980 123
Table 44
Type, Place And Skill Level Of Present Employment, 1978 127
Table 45
Type, Place And Skill Level Of Present Employment, 1980 128
Table 46
Previous Vocational Ability Of Students, 1978 129

Table 47
Previous Vocational Ability Of Students, 1980 130
Table 48
Type, Place And Skill Level Of Previous Employment, Gender By Year 132
Table 49
Frequencies And Percentages Of Subjects Enrolled In Adult School Programmes, Gender By Year 136
Table 50
Type Of Courses Enrolled In, Gender By Year 136
Table 51
Type Of Courses Presently Enrolled In, Gender By Year ..138
Table 52
Type Of Courses Previously Enrolled In For Subjects Not Enrolled In Courses, Gender By Year 139

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A Master's Thesis like the one presented here was not easily or quickly produced. Its completion depended on support from a large number of people and agencies.

I would like to express my appreciation to my advisor Dr. Peggy Koopman for her years of support in seeing this project completed. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. Todd Rogers and Dr. David Kendall, for their advice and guidance throughout the project.

This project was completed with the financial assistance of a research grant from the Educational Research Institute of British Columbia.

A word of thanks must also go to the large number of personnel in school district offices, schools, workshops, group homes, and MR associations who helped to establish contact with potential subjects and arrange interviews.

A special thanks to the subjects in the study who welcomed me into their homes and helped me learn a little bit about their lives.

Thank you to the colleagues and friends who provided moral support and helpful criticism. And especially Sharon who typed.

And finally to Rachelle, who came into my life when this project was being done and made sure it was completed.

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

Background of the Problem

"From the time of the first treatment center for the mentally retarded in the mid-nineteenth century, the major goal of interested disciplines and services has been to help the mentally retarded individual achieve social and occupational adequacy" (Goldstein, 1964, p. 214). However, once a student or resident leaves a school or an institution it is difficult to know whether that individual has achieved social and occupational adequacy. One method of determining the social and occupational adequacy of mentally retarded individuals after they leave a school or an institution is the follow-up study.

Fernald (1919) is credited with reporting the first follow-up study of a mentally retarded population. The study was important because it determined the characteristics of both males and females who did and did not make a successful adjustment to living in the community (Cobb, 1972). The criterion for successful adjustment was not returning to the institution (Cobb, 1972; Goldstein, 1964; and McCarver & Craig, 1974). Reviews of the literature (Cobb, 1972; Eagle, 1967; Goldstein, 1964; Kokaska, 1968; McCarver & Craig, 1974; Rosen, Clark, & Kivitz, 1977; and Windle, 1962) show that a large body of research has developed since Fernald's first study. From

this large body of literature four major issues have been identified as important to the way follow-up research is conducted and the results reported. These issues are:

a) Institutional and Non-Institutional Populations

The influence of the eugenics movement in the early part of the twentieth century brought about a rapid growth of institutions designed to keep the mentally retarded away from society. These large custodial institutions provided the first subjects for follow-up studies. Fernald (1919) interviewed 646 former patients from Waverly State School living in the community. As mentioned previously, one of the most important findings was that the mentally retarded could, in fact, successfully adjust to living in the community. Succeeding studies conducted by Matthews (1922); Storrs (1924); Little and Johnson (1932); Hegge (1944); Coakley (1945); Wolfson (1956); and Rosen et al. (1977), using the follow-up methodology developed by Fernald, also found that former institutionalized adults could adjust to living in the community. The criteria of adjustment in the studies varied widely and will be discussed as a separate issue.

There are a number of limitations in this research. One of the limitations of this type of research, "based on institutional populations, lies in the high degree of selectivity of those populations. It may well be . . . that institutionalization itself contributes a significant variable in determining behavior to the extent that generalization across

institutional and non-institutional populations is highly tenuous at best" (Cobb, 1972, p. 21).

Other studies have been conducted using non-institutionalized subjects identified as retarded by community agencies or the public school system. Goldstein (1964) notes that "while these persons are of comparable mental status with the higher grade person in public institutions, their behavior or the relationship between their behavior and the level of community tolerance for certain behaviors has been such as to permit their continuance in the community" (p. 233).

Well known examples of research on community-based populations are Kolstoe (1961); Kolstoe & Shafter (1961); Stephens & Peck (1968); Cobb (1972); Peterson & Smith (1960); Kennedy (1948, 1966); Richardson (1978); Saenger (1957); Stanfield (1973); and Lambert (1976). These few studies have used a wide variety of research methodologies and criteria of adjustment to obtain a wide variety of findings.

There are two limitations in research using a community based population. The first limitation is the difficulty encountered in obtaining a sufficiently large sample of subjects to participate in the study. The second limitation is the attrition of a sample over time. Rosen et al. (1977) noted that "the reasons for subject loss include geographical limitations, change of address, refusal to cooperate, and death" (p. 147).

b) Definitions of Mental Retardation

> Criticism can probably be leveled with some justification at most follow-up studies in which IQ has been used as the sole criterion for defining the subject groups, whether the subjects were previously in special public school classes or were institutionalized, they were usually identified from past records without benefit of comprehensive diagnostic procedures. In some cases, an implicit assumption was made that enrollment in a special class or confinement to an institution constituted an operational definition of retardation. In other cases, IQ estimates may have been lacking in stability between the time of initial identification of the sample and subsequent follow-up. Ranges of IQs of retarded subjects have differed widely from study to study, with few attempts to differentiate borderline or near normal subjects from those with more severe deficits. (Rosen et al., 1977, p. 144).

The difficulties with defining mental retardation would seem to be almost universal. Research conducted on any type of population and using any type of methodology would have to deal with this issue. And in all cases this is an issue that would not be easily resolved.

c) Criteria of Adjustment

One of the main difficulties in follow-up research has been the lack of consistency in the criteria on which judgment of success or failure of subjects' community adjustment has been based (McCarver & Craig, 1974). In extensive reviews of the literature on institutional populations Goldstein (1964) and McCarver & Craig (1974) reported that not returning to an institutional environment was the major criteria for successful community adjustment.

Research on community-based populations (Delp & Lorenz,

1952; Kennedy, 1948, 1966; Lambert, 1976; Saenger, 1957; and Stanfield, 1973) has attempted to consider many other criteria. These criteria are living environment, type of employment, job changes, savings and money management, sexual problems, antisocial behaviour, marriage and children, and use of leisure time. In fact, these criteria were also considered by McCarver & Craig (1974) for present institutional populations.

d) Research Methodology

McCarver & Craig (1974) suggested that there were three categories of follow-up research methodology: prognostic, simple follow-up (descriptive), and comparative. McCarver & Craig distinguished the types of methodology on the basis of the experimenter's purpose. Cobb (1972) suggested four categories of research methodology for follow-up studies: descriptive, prognostic, analytical, and case study. Cobb in his categorization of follow-up methodology did not distinguish between comparative and descriptive research although he did give examples of both. And although the case study method was mentioned no examples were given. Hence, for the purposes of this study the four categories of methodology discussed are prognostic, comparative, analytical, and descriptive.

1) Prognostic

Prognostic studies try to find variables which will predict the adjustment of mentally retarded adults after leaving the school system or an institution (McCarver & Craig, 1974). Cobb

(1972), Goldstein (1964), and Wolfensberger (1967) note that the prognosis of successful community adjustment is complicated by the ambiguities in the criteria of success.

2) Analytical

Analytical studies, often using multivariate techniques, try to identify the multiple predictors and multiple criteria of adjustment (Cobb, 1972), and hence, are often considered to be a more sophisticated form of prognostic study. There are some weaknesses in this methodology. "Studies attempting to combine factors in order to obtain the most discriminating prognostic index possible have not been cross-validated, or have not maintained comparability of conditions, hence have failed to yield reliable indices" (Cobb, 1972, p. 57).

A comparison of these two types of studies emphasizes the different aspects of follow-up research and how the desired outcomes are determined by the methodologies employed.

3) Comparative

The comparative study "is distinguished by some attempt to compare the retardate's environment in the community to some other relevant group" (McCarver & Craig, 1974, p. 149). Studies done by Kennedy (1948, 1966), Peterson & Smith (1960), Richardson (1978) showed that the retarded usually did not do as well as their matched normal peers on particular indices of adjustment. Goldstein (1964) and McCarver & Craig (1974) also note that what constitutes a relevant control group for

comparison is not at all clear.

A comparison between prognostic and comparative studies indicates that the information desired by a researcher is quite different from each other.

4) Descriptive

In descriptive studies no attempt is made to isolate predictor variables (McCarver & Craig, 1974). These studies look at the status of a group of people after a specified time period. The results in this type of study are reported in a descriptive matter detailing the status of the group of subjects (Gay, 1976).

Some examples of this research are Delp & Lorenz (1952), Dinger (1961), Edgerton (1967), Rosen et al. (1977), Saenger (1957), Stanfield (1973), and Tisdall (1960). All seven of these studies described the community adjustment of mentally retarded adults in terms of one or more of the following variables:

i) living environment
ii) type of employment
iii) job changes
iv) savings and money management
v) antisocial behaviour
vi) marriage and children
vii) use of leisure time

Canadian Research

Cobb (1972) in his review of the literature found that follow-up research in other countries was similar to that in the United States. Cobb cited examples of research on institutional population in Canada and Great Britain, as well as research on community populations in Great Britain and Australia. The research cited used examples of prognostic, comparative, and descriptive methodologies. The findings, like those in the United States, reflected the varying criteria for success and the different types of mentally retarded populations used.

The focus of interest in this study is the follow-up research conducted in Canada. The two studies on institutional populations cited by Cobb were Grant (1956) and Lambert & Racine (1959). Grant (1956) considered subjects successful "if the trainee maintained his or her position in society without conflict leading to official interference" (p. 918). Lambert & Racine (1959) found that 56.7% of the males released from the institution adapted well to living in a community environment.

Two Canadian follow-up studies on community populations have been reported. The highlights of these two studies are presented here because of the interest in community-based populations. The two studies are examples of descriptive follow-up research. Lambert (1976) looked at the community adjustment of mentally retarded adults living in Ontario. The adults' adjustment was measured in terms of their personal appearance, mobility independence, self-sufficiency, integration

in the home, interaction level, and vocational ability. Lusthaus, Hanrahan, & Lusthaus (1979) looked at the adults' community adjustment in terms of their economic conditions, social integration, and level of self-determination to live on their own. The findings here were not inconsistent with the large body of research in the United States. In both these studies most of the subjects were not very successful in their adjustment to the communities. The majority of subjects were found to be unemployed, uninvolved in their communities and, particularly in Lambert's study, quite dependent.

Research in the province of British Columbia has concerned itself with how the community looks at the mentally retarded. Willms (1978), for example, found that neighbours' primary concern about a group home for retarded adults was the way it was operated. Other research has looked at the employment for the handicapped; a study that was done by the Social Planning and Review Council of British Columbia (1980) showed only a small number of handicapped people employed in the public or private sector.

While the research being done in B.C. is important, it has not addressed itself to how the mentally retarded are adjusting to living in the community.

The present research project was designed to give a description of the community adjustment of mentally retarded adults living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was, therefore, to provide a portrayal of how moderately retarded adults were adjusting to living in their communities in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, one and three years after they have graduated from school. Adjustment was defined in terms of four of the six components considered by Lambert (1976). The four components were mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, and vocational ability.

Description of Components of Community Adjustment

The four components of community adjustment were defined in the following manner:

1) Mobility Independence

The extent to which a moderately retarded adult travelled in his/her community as indicated by:

a) the forms of transportation used
b) the frequency of use of the transportation
c) the destinations travelled to
d) the supervision required when using the transportation
e) the frequency and reasons for getting lost

2) Self-Sufficiency

The extent to which a moderately retarded adult displayed competence in:

a) preparation of meals (frequency and degree of difficulty)
b) carrying out home management tasks (making beds, dusting, washing dishes, etc.)
c) handling money (degree of control and kinds of things

bought)

3) Interaction Level

The extent to which a moderately retarded adult interacted socially, inside and outside his/her house, as indicated by:

a) the number of different leisure and social activities participated in
b) the frequency of that participation
c) whom he/she participated with

Also considered were:

d) the living arrangements of the moderately retarded adult, and
e) the frequency and kinds of interactions with various types of people.

4) Vocational Ability

An indication of a moderately retarded adult's
a) employment status-
present and past employment history, including whether or not the person had ever worked; duration of job; full or part-time status; and place of work
b) occupational status-
highest skill level ever obtained in any job

The four variables were retained because of their importance as both components of adaptive behaviour (Foster, Nihira, & Leland, 1966; Nihira, 1969a & 1969b; and Marlett, 1973) and indices of the post school community adjustment of mentally retarded adults (Peterson & Smith, 1960; Richardson, 1978; Rosen et al., 1977; Saenger, 1957; and Stanfield, 1973).

Personal appearance was the only variable of the six considered by Lambert (1976) not included in this study. The basis for Lambert's measurement of personal appearance was the subjective observations of each of the interviewers. There was

an attempt to keep data in this study as objective as possible, and because of this personal appearance was not considered.

Integration in the home was not considered a variable by itself. Instead it was combined with the section on interaction level. This was done to make the data more compact and manageable.

A fifth variable, educational status, was added to the four components already defined. The idea of post school educational programmes for mentally retarded adults is not one that has received much consideration. Saenger (1957) reported that 20% of the subjects' parents wanted some form of education programme beyond the formal time of school attendance. Katz (1968) reported on the lack of appropriate programmes for mentally handicapped adults. Educational status was an important indicator of the mentally retarded adults' participation in their community.

Other Terms and Issues

For the purposes of this study the term moderately retarded denotes those adults who spent the last three years of their formal education in schools or programmes (segregated or integrated) designated for the moderately retarded and have graduated from such schools or programmes.

Graduation is traditionally thought of when a person completes a course of study at a school, college, or university

and receives a diploma or degree. Normal students go to elementary school (5-12 years of age) and high school (13-18 years of age). Students in schools for the moderately retarded usually range in age from five to 19 years. In effect these schools provide 14 years of education. At the end of the 14 years of school, they are considered to have graduated. With their formal education finished many of the graduates look for work. Usually these graduates find work in sheltered workshops.

It is the time period after graduation that is the concern of this research. Using June, 1981 as a point of reference, the adults who graduated in June, 1980 (one year before) and June, 1978 (three years before) were interviewed to obtain information on their adjustment to living in the community.

Reviews of the literature (Cobb, 1972; Goldstein, 1964; Kokaska, 1968; and McCarver & Craig, 1974) reveal that there is no consistent pattern or rationale as to why any time periods (after graduation from an institution or school programme) were chosen for follow-up studies.

In this study one year after graduation was chosen because it would show some of the difficulties (if any) initially encountered by the graduates in establishing themselves in the community. And three years was chosen because at this point it might be assumed that the initial difficulties would be over and a lifestyle would begin to emerge.

Reviews of the literature on gender differences (Eagle,

1967; Goldstein, 1964; and McCarver & Craig, 1974) reported a wide variety of findings; none of the differences found were consistent or very strong. McCarver & Craig (1974), in particular, reported that out of 20 studies comparing males and females on overall success rates of community placement, ten reported a higher success rate for males, seven reported a higher success rate for females, and three reported no difference. In light of these inconsistent findings it was considered important to investigate gender differences in this study.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The purposes of this study lead to the identification of three research questions. The research questions were:

(1) Are there differences between males and females on mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status?

(2) Are there differences between groups who graduated in 1978 and 1980 on mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status?

(3) Are there differences between males and females who graduated in 1978 and 1980 on mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status?

The corresponding hypotheses, stated in the null form,

were:

(1) There are no differences between males and females on mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status.

(2) There are no differences one and three years after graduation on mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status.

(3) There are no differences between gender and years since graduation on mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status.

Organization of the Thesis

The first chapter includes a general background of the problem, the purpose of the study, definition of the components of community adjustment, and the research questions and hypotheses. Chapter 2 consists of the review of the literature. In Chapter 3 the procedures used to develop and test the interview-prompt recording sheet are presented. Chapter 4 provides a description of the procedures used in conducting the study and analyzing the data. In Chapter 5 the results of the analysis and discussion of the results are provided. Finally, Chapter 6 comprises a summary of the findings, limitations, conclusions and implications of the study, as well as suggestions for further research.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"Interest is longitudinal and follow-up studies of the mentally deficient derives from several sources. Parents, medical statisticians, and physicians are interested in the expectation of life of persons suffering from different diseases or handicaps. Teachers want to know how much of the skills taught at school is retained, and what use is made of them. The effect on social competence of education and training is of obvious importance to those responsible for planning training programmes . . ." (Tizard, 1965, p. 482).

Studies on Institutional Populations

The first significant follow-up study was conducted by Walter Fernald (1919) on the graduates of Waverly State School (a residential institution for the mentally retarded) in Massachusetts during a twenty-five year period 1890-1914, to see how successfully they adjusted to living in the community.

In Fernald's study information on 646 subjects (470 males and 176 females) was obtained from interviews with their familiies and local officials like church ministers and police. Fernald found that 305 males and 52 females were leading what Fernald called 'useful and blameless lives'. Some of the

subjects referred to in this matter were self-supporting and lived independently, while others were working at jobs in their communities or in their homes and others just stayed at home. Fernald also found 55 males and 38 females who had difficulties in adjusting to living in the community. These subjects had records of sexual offences, alcoholism, and theft.

In comparing the well-adjusted with the poorly adjusted subjects Fernald found that the "distinguishing differences appeared to be the amount of acceptance each required. The successful were counseled and aided by friends and relatives who supervised their activities and channeled them in socially acceptable directions." (Goldstein, 1964, p. 221-222).

The work done by Fernald (1919) is considered important for two reasons. The first is that Fernald's research established a methodology to conduct follow-up studies. The second is a political reason. Fernald's data showed that the retarded could in fact improve and successfully adjust to living in the community. This was particularly significant at a time when the retarded were locked away for the protection of society (Cobb, 1972; Goldstein, 1964; and Rosen et al., 1977).

Fernald's (1919) contributions were followed by other research studies on institutional populations. McCarver and Craig (1974) reported that there have been at least 175 published reports concerning the post-institutional adjustment of the mentally retarded. From reviews of the literature (Cobb, 1972; Goldstein, 1964; McCarver & Craig, 1974; and Rosen et al.,

1977) a small number of these studies are presented to give a better understanding of follow-up research on institutional populations.

Studies conducted by Matthews (1922), Storrs (1924), Little & Johnson (1932) (all cited in Goldstein, 1964 and Cobb, 1972), Hegge (1944), Coakley (1945), and Wolfson (1956) all looked at the criteria of success or failure in community adjustment in terms of employment, lack of criminal record, and ability to stay out of an institution.

The rates of success have varied widely in these studies. Matthews (1922) who based her study on Fernald's recommendations for the planned release of institutional residents found that 97% of her subjects (all male) made a satisfactory adjustment to living in the community. The largest number of subjects in this study were classified as mildly retarded. And Little & Johnson (1932) using the same criteria as Storrs (1924) found that 84% of the males and 82.5% of the females were successful. However, "there was little basis for comparing these groups because of the marked differences that existed between them" (Goldstein, 1964, p. 227).

Two studies conducted during the Second World War by Hegge (1944) and Coakley (1945) found that formerly institutionalized retarded persons were successfully working in defense plants and other war related jobs. Hegge (1944) found that 85% of the subjects in his study were working. The studies done by Hegge (1944) and Coakley (1945) also showed that these former

residents were able to work at jobs above the unskilled level.

A large amount of research in the post-war period continued to produce a wide variety of results. Wolfson (1956) found that 62% of the mildly retarded males and 73% of the mildly retarded females made satisfactory community adjustments. In their research Windle, Stewart & Brown (1961) found that former residents in vocational placement, home placement, and family care placement had only a 50% success rate.

The previous findings may be further contrasted to a series of studies reported by Rosen, Clark & Kivitz (1977) on the former residents of Elwyn Institute. The studies looked at the community functioning of the former residents in terms of their vocational adjustment, economic adjustment, and personal-social adjustment. The studies showed that 90% of the subjects were employed in unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. Economically 50% of the subjects subscribed to their own telephone, 20% were paying for purchases on credit, and over 60% had bought some form of life insurance. In terms of their personal-social adjustment 30% of the subjects were married and 90% were able to make new friends although most did not participate in formal social groups.

To reiterate, the studies presented here are only a very small example of a rather extensive body of research literature. The few examples, however, do show three of the important issues which must be addressed when considering this type of research.

Criteria of Adjustment

One of the most important issues is the lack of uniform and consistent criteria of success and failure in community adjustment across studies. Windle (1962) and Eagle (1967) in two extensive reviews of the literature on instutionalized populations present this as their major criticism of the research. Windle (1962) also found that there were serious methodological problems which limited the reliability of findings and the generalizability of the results.

More recent reviews of the literature (McCarver & Craig, 1974; and Rosen et al., 1977) have suggested more consistent criteria. These criteria are living environment, type of employment, job changes, savings and money management, sexual problems, antisocial behaviour, marriage and children, and use of leisure time. McCarver & Craig (1974) also point out the need for consistency in defining these criteria. In terms of the consistency of the criteria of adjustment, the examples of research presented in this section are actually quite stable. An evaluation of the research shows there are more serious differences in the types of samples used.

Cobb (1972) pointed out that there was already a high degree of selectivity in institutional populations. He also pointed out that this "selectivity tends to vary from one institution to another and within an institution over time" (p. 21).

Definition of Mental Retardation

Another influence on the differences in samples comes from the way the subjects are defined as mentally retarded. In the earliest studies (Fernald, 1919; and Matthews, 1922) terms like idiot, imbecile and moron were used to describe the subjects. Terms like severely, moderately, and mildly retarded are referred to in the studies done by Storrs (1924) and Little & Johnson (1932) but there is no data reported on what is meant by these categories and hence how comparable the samples are.

IQ has always been considered an important criterion in the definition of retardation. Hegge (1944) reported a mean IQ of 71.8 for the subjects in his study. If this kind of information was reported today the subjects in the study would not even be considered retarded. Using the classification system developed by Grossman (1973), subjects scoring above 69 on a standardized intelligence test would be above the category of mildly retarded.

The study conducted by Rosen et al. (1977) presents another very different sample. Rosen et al. found that at discharge from the institution the average IQ was 75.6. "All had severe educational deficits; the majority were functioning below a fourth grade reading level" (p. 155). From the data presented it would be quite difficult to make an accurate comparison between this sample and any of the previous ones.

The last issue to be considered is that of the economic and

social conditions during the years studied (Rosen et al., 1977). McCarver & Craig (1974) divided the research into four time periods. These were 1918-1935; 1935-1954; 1954-1960; and 1960-1970. They found that the period 1935-1945 had the highest rate of success. The reasons suggested are first because of the manpower shortage during the war and as a result the retarded had an easier time finding jobs. The results of the studies done by Hegge (1944) and Coakley (1945) are consistent with the above explanation.

The second suggestion is that in comparison to the 1918-1935 period there was less concern about eugenics. This, of course, was one of the major concerns of Fernald (1919) in even suggesting that the mentally retarded be allowed to live and work in the community.

Follow-up research as we know it was almost totally dependent upon institutional populations. The studies done were descriptive in nature and reflected criteria of adjustment that could vary quite widely. Rosen et al. (1977) have suggested that interpretation of success or failure also depended on the investigator's "individual value or moral judgements about what to accept as a high or low success ratio" (p. 134). Other considerations in this research are the types of samples used and the period of time in which the research was done. Despite these weaknesses the research has played an important role in providing information about the adjustment of formerly institutionalized retarded persons.

In the next section of the literature review the research on non-institutional populations will be examined.

Studies on Non-Institutional Populations

The early follow-up studies of community-based populations were descriptive accounts of what former students were doing in the community after they left school. These studies often looked at the same criteria of adjustment as the institutional studies; police record, marriage, and employment (Goldstein, 1964; and Cobb, 1972).

Research Methodologies

As indicated in Chapter 1, descriptive research was only one of four methods of conducting follow-up studies. The research conducted on non-institutional populations is presented in the context of the four methodologies: prognostic, analytical, comparative, and descriptive.

Prognostic

As mentioned previously, one of the most important findings in Fernald's (1919) study was that the mentally retarded could successfully live in the community. Since that time a large part of follow-up research has been done to predict the probable outcomes of the lives of mentally retarded adults once they leave an institution or a school.

Wolfensberger (1967), in an extensive review of the literature on predictive studies lists five weaknesses in this type of research. These are: poor design and control, lack of cross-validation, lack of confirmation across studies, emphasis on variables associated with the retardate, and weaknesses of some predictors. Cobb (1972), in his review of the literature on predictive studies, suggests three weaknesses that are consistent with those of Wolfensberger (1967). Cobb (1972) looks at the lack of heterogeneity in criterion variables, the lack of organization of predictor variables, and the problem of temporality.

There are a large number of studies that could be examined to show examples of any of the weaknesses listed above. For the purposes of practicality two studies, Kolstoe (1961) and Kolstoe & Shafter (1961) will be discussed to indicate the nature of this type of research. The two studies focus on employment, a variable that has always been considered important in the community adjustment of mentally retarded adults.

Kolstoe (1961) conducted a study to determine the importance of specific factors on the employability of mentally retarded adults. Two groups of mentally retarded adults (41 in each group) who were former clients in a work training project were selected for study. One group consisted of 41 males who were employed and the other group 41 males who were unemployed. The subjects in the two groups were compared on 91 characteristics of a background, intellectual personality,

social and vocational nature. The subjects who were employed were superior in physical, personality, social, and work characteristics.

While one part of the research shows that better physical, personality, social, and work characteristics were important for employment, another part of the research suggests that there are "conflicting results as to the relationship between these variables and vocational success . . ." (Kolstoe & Shafter, 1961, p. 287). This is especially so because success and failure for the mentally retarded should not be defined in the same way as for the normal population. "What is needed is a clear statement of what is to be predicted" (p. 289). In this way there would be some relationship between the subjects' work potential and actual performance. This would also help show that "those variables that make for success in one situation may make for failure in another" (Wolfensberger, 1967, p. 242).

There is no doubt that predictive studies have played a major role in the development of follow-up research. The research conducted by Kolstoe (1961) and Kolstoe & Shafter (1961) support the criticisms of predictive studies by Wolfensberger (1967) and Cobb (1972). There is indeed a weakness of some predictors, there is an emphasis on variables associated with the retarded, and there is a lack of heterogeneity in criterion variables. It is because of these flaws and difficulties that predictive research will not be considered for the purposes of this study.

Analytical

Analytical studies try to identify the multiple predictors and multiple criteria of adjustment that the prognostic studies cannot identify. Stephens & Peck (1968) conducted a study that looked at developing measures of success and "determining the probable relationship between predictor-personality and cognitive-variables and the criterion-success" (p. 1). In his review of the literature Cobb (1972) cites several other multivariate studies. Among these are Shulman (1967) and Bower & Switzer (1962).

An evaluation of multivariate studies was not pursued because the design in this study did not require it.

Comparative

The comparative study "is distinguished by some attempt to compare the retardate in the community to some other relevant group" (McCarver & Craig, 1974, p. 149).

Presented here are four studies as examples of this type of methodology and its role in follow-up research.

Peterson & Smith (1960) in an effort to find out what kind of citizens the adult educable mentally retarded become after they leave school did a comparative study between the EMR adults and normal adults of low economic status. The 45 subjects (15 females and 30 males) in each group were matched by gender and age. The two groups were compared on educational, work, home,

family, social, and civic characteristics. The results showed that normal adults did better in all aspects of adjustment.

From these results, the researchers conclude that "a well-planned educational program at the senior high school level is needed to complete the training and preparation of mentally retarded pupils for community membership" (Peterson & Smith, 1960, p. 408).

Peterson & Smith (1960) is an example of a study that raises more questions that it answers. Perhaps one of the most basic questions is why the EMR adults are compared with normal adults at low economic status. However, it seems that Goldstein (1964) and McCarver & Craig (1974) are quite correct in stating that what does constitute a relevant control group for comparison is not at all clear. Two studies by Kennedy (1966) in 1948 and 1960 looked at the social adjustment of mildly retarded adults compared to normal adults in a Connecticut city. In the study 256 mildly retarded adults were matched with 129 normal controls. Controls were matched for age, sex, race, country of birth, nationality, and father's occupation. The only difference between the groups was in their intelligence levels; the retarded group had scores ranging from 50 to 75, while the controls had scores of 70 and above.

The criteria of adjustment in the 1948 study were parental and family background, marital adjustment, economic adjustment, anti-social behaviour, and social participation and leisure time activities. The 1960 study looked at the same basic criteria

but also included the intellectual state of the children of both groups. It should be noted that 70% of the original sample participated in the 1960 study. The results of the two studies showed that most of the subjects in both groups married. In terms of employment the handicapped subjects worked mostly in unskilled jobs while the normal subjects worked in higher-level occupations. No significant differences were reported for both groups in terms of any difficulties with the police.

The results of the Kennedy studies showed that mildly retarded adults do in fact make a very positive adjustment in the community after they leave school.

The main criticism of the Kennedy studies "is in the failure to review the intellectual status of her subjects at the two follow-up stages. Kennedy assumes that any recorded IQ score between 45 and 75 sufficiently and permanently identifies an individual as a 'moron' or a member of the population of the mildly retarded" (Cobb, 1972, p. 30).

In contrast to Kennedy's (1966) research, Richardson (1978) did a comparative study between subjects "who were administratively classified as mentally retarded and placed in special education facilities or residential care at any time during their school years" (p. 351) and normal subjects. But, since they had left school and were no longer receiving mental retardation services, the mentally retarded persons were no longer considered retarded.

Seventy-six subjects (living in Aberdeen, Scotland) in each of two groups were matched for age, sex, occupation of father, where the child lived at age eight to ten, and the type of housing lived in at the time of the interviews. The subjects interviewed were all 22 years of age. The only difference between the two groups was their IQ and that was not reported.

The criteria of adjustment in this study were employment, interpersonal relationships, and leisure time activities. There were both objective and subjective measures of these criteria.

The findings in this study were consistent with the previous studies. The former mentally retarded students had a higher rate of unemployment and those working made less money than the normal subjects. Socially, the mentally retarded students were less successful than their normal counterparts.

A summary comment on comparative research, based on the four studies discussed in this section, can be made with reference to two important issues. The first issue is that in the four studies cited the criteria for adjustment were similar and were reflected in consistent results. This is important because the lack of consistent criteria of adjustment has been one of the major flaws in follow-up research (Wolfensberger, 1967; and Cobb, 1972).

The second issue is that while comparative research appears to be reliable it also seems to be somewhat limited in the amount of information it can provide. In all four studies cited

the non-retarded group of adults made a better overall community adjustment than the retarded group of adults. This data adds support to the contention that what constitutes a relevant control group for comparison is not at all clear (Goldstein, 1964; and McCarver & Craig, 1974). This would seem to substantially limit the usefulness of this type of follow-up research.

A comparison of the three types of research presented thus far shows that there are some differences and similarities in their purposes. Prognostic and analytical studies are similar in their desire to predict the probable outcomes of the lives of mentally retarded adults once they leave an institution or school. The prognostic study does this using a univariate analysis while the analytic study employs a multivariate analysis. In contrast to prognostic and analytical research, comparative research has as its main goal comparisons between the adjustment of mentally retarded adults and a designated control group.

Descriptive

The fourth and last methodology of follow-up research to be considered is descriptive.

Presented here are three studies as examples of this type of methodology and its role in follow-up research.

Saenger (1957) in a comprehensive study looked at the

community adjustment of 520 former pupils in the New York City special classes for the severely retarded from 1929 to 1955. The basis for data collection was a Depth Interview Schedule and check list which provided information on characteristics of the severely retarded and their families, institutionalization, home adjustment, community adjustment, vocational adjustment, use of community resources, and planning for the future.

Saenger's results showed both positive and negative aspects of his subjects' community adjustment. The positive aspect of their lives in the community was evident by the fact that the subjects found jobs, made necessary social adjustments, and moved about the community with some level of independence (Cobb, 1972). It should be noted that this was accomplished with virtually no community resources. Indeed, the first workshop and rehabilitation facility was opened by the Association for Help of Retarded Children in New York City in 1953 (Cobb, 1972; and Wolfensberger, 1967).

The negative aspects of the subjects' community adjustment were in the loneliness and idleness that many of them experienced (Cobb, 1972). "Much of the time spent outside the home was spent just hanging around the street by themselves, doing nothing. About one-half of those still living in the community occupied themselves in this manner, lounged around neighbourhood stores and, more rarely, visited pool rooms or drug stores" (Saenger, 1957, p. 103).

Saenger's (1957) study is an example of comprehensive

descriptive research. There are, however, two issues that should be examined. The first issue is the usage of the term 'severely retarded'. Changes in the definition and classification of mental retardation (Grossman, 1973) would have the subjects in Saenger's study classified as moderately retarded.

The second issue is that of gender differences. Saenger (1957) did not distinguish between the adjustments of males and females in this study. His only interest in gender differences was in relation to employment. Saenger found that more men than women were able to find work and men earned more money than women. The explanation offered for this is in the types of jobs found by the subjects. "Much of the factory work performed by our men was heavy work, unsuited for women. Only in jobs like cutting and folding, light assembly work, did we find retarded women" (Saenger, 1957, p. 131).

The second descriptive study to be considered was conducted by Stanfield (1973) on 120 graduates (65 boys and 55 girls) of classes for the moderately retarded in a large southern California metropolitan school district during the years 1968, 1969, and 1970. A modified version of Saenger's (1957) depth interview schedule was used to gather the data. The interviews were conducted with the parents or guardians of each subject and looked at five aspects of community adjustment. These were vital statistics, school history, work and post school rehabilitation programmes, life at home, and life in the

community. The results of the study showed the subjects' participation in the community to be quite limited. Most subjects were dependent on their families for transportation and participation in social activities. Almost half of the subjects in the study were not involved in any form of employment. The most positive aspect of their community adjustment was their ability to do home management tasks like making a bed and taking out the garbage. As a result of the findings Stanfield suggests the need for comprehensive postschool habilitative programmes.

An evaluation of Stanfield's (1973) study shows that it is similar to Saenger's (1957) study in three ways. First, it is similar in the type of population to be studied. Second, the studies are similar in the method of gathering data. As mentioned above, Stanfield (1973) used a modified form of Saenger's (1957) depth interview schedule. And in both studies parents and guardians were interviewed. The third similarity is that there is not much distinction made between the adjustments of males and females. In fact, Stanfield (1973) reports no comparisons between males and females on any aspects of community adjustment.

The only difference between the two studies is in the number of years considered after graduation from school. This would seem to reinforce the idea that there is no consistent pattern as to why time periods are chosen (Cobb, 1972; Goldstein, 1964; Kokaska, 1968; and McCarver & Craig, 1974).

The last descriptive study to be discussed was done by

Lambert (1976). In his study Lambert looked at the community adjustment of 454 mentally retarded adults living in the province of Ontario. The sample of adults was drawn from the list of mentally retarded persons receiving family benefits allowance from the provincial government.

The interviews were conducted with the retarded adults. During the interviews a Social Knowledge Scale, a Health Knowledge Scale, and a Beta IQ examination were given to measure each subject's capacity. Subjects were also interviewed to find out the type of environment (family constellation, housing, residential stability, and social distance) they lived in and finally the six attributes of adaptive behaviour (personal appearance, mobility independence, self-sufficiency, integration in the home, interaction level, and vocational ability) they possessed. Then in a rather lengthy series of procedures the data were analyzed in terms of the three domains: capacity, environment, and adaptive behaviour.

The results of the study showed the subjects to be lonely, isolated, and dependent. More specifically Lambert reported that "almost three-fourths of these adults were totally dependent on others to transport them beyond their home. One-quarter to one-third were dependent on others for their shopping and activities of daily living" (p. 3).

The study conducted by Lambert (1976) is quite different from the previous two studies in several respects. First Lambert used the mentally retarded adults as his primary source

of information, while Saenger (1957) and Stanfield (1973) interviewed the subjects' parents and guardians. Lambert does not take any steps to make sure the information he received was accurate. He also considered this in his study when he wrote, "in view of the fact that one-half of the group which responded to the full questionnaire was moderately or severely retarded, questions can be raised about the reliability of the data" (p. 26). In the same light it should also be noted that, of the 454 subjects interviewed, 81 persons were unable to answer all the questions and had to be dropped from the study. This left a final sample of 373 subjects.

The sample used in Lambert's study was quite different from the previous studies. Lambert's sample seems to be more heterogeneous as indicated by the fact that about one-half of the sample were considered to be mildly retarded and capable of achieving a grade six education.

In other descriptive studies the data were used so that they could be measured using a nominal scale. Lambert used the same kind of data and measured them on an interval and/or ordinal scale. This would appear to make his analysis quite suspect. The paradox is that the findings in many respects are similar to those of the previous research.

Like the other methodologies, descriptive research is not without its weaknesses. One of the most frequently mentioned weaknesses is that it is not as rigorous in design or analysis as other methods (Cobb, 1972; McCarver & Craig, 1974; and Rosen

et al., 1977), but it is not meant to be.

Of the four follow-up methodologies presented in this section, the descriptive method will be used in this research project. The criteria of community adjustment discussed in the analysis of descriptive research will also be used. In this way the research project will attempt to present the most clear and concise picture of the community adjustment of moderately retarded adults living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia.

Summary and Implications For The Present Study

A summary of the review of the literature in follow-up research shows that the first studies were conducted almost exclusively on institutional populations. The studies done tended to build on one another but the results of the research varied. This was because of the different criteria of adjustment considered, the different samples used, and the different time periods in which the research was done.

A large body of research has also been done on non-institutional populations. Research on non-institutional populations has been divided into four methodologies. These are prognostic, analytical, comparative, and descriptive. Results of the research vary with the methodology used. Results also reflect the same factors mentioned above for research on institutional populations.

The review of the literature on follow-up research has led to the selection of descriptive methodology as used by Saenger (1957), Stanfield (1973), and Lambert (1976). The criteria of adjustment to be examined (mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, and vocational ability) are those found in the same research. The basis for the collection of data will be a revised questionnaire appropriate to the needs of the study.

This will be used to examine the community adjustment of moderately retarded adults living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia one and three years after graduating from school.

CHAPTER 3

Instrument Development

In order to gather the necessary information on the moderately retarded adults' mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status a semi-formal structured personal interview was used. In this kind of interview the same questions are asked in the same order, but not necessarily in the same way. Appropriate probes and/or prompts are used to insure that each subject understands and interprets the questions as intended. This approach is especially suited for a moderately retarded-type of population because many moderately retarded adults experience some difficulty with either receptive or expressive language or, sometimes, both.

The personal aspect of the interview is another important and necessary part of the data collection process. Face-to-face interviews fulfill two important needs. These are:

1) keep the subject concentrating on the task during the interview; and
2) compensate for the subject's limited reading skills.

A review of the literature (Saenger, 1957; Stanfield, 1973; Lambert, 1976; Rosen, et al., 1977; and Richardson, 1978) revealed that there was no questionnaire presently available that was completely suitable for the needs of this study.

Consequently, it became necessary to develop an interview and recording schedule. Described in this chapter are the procedures followed to develop and pilot test the interview-recording form used.

Draft I

Since this study was closely modelled after the study completed by Lambert (1976), the questionnaire used in that study served as the initial basis for the present study. Lambert's questionnaire contained 77 questions separated into the following six components: personal appearance, mobility independence, self-sufficiency, integration in the home, interaction level, and vocational ability.

As previously explained in Chapter 1, four of the six components considered by Lambert were considered in the present study. The four components were mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, and vocational ability, to which a fifth, educational status, was added. A copy of the questions used by Lambert to measure the first four components is presented in Appendix A.

The first part of the revision entailed the elimination of questions within each of the components that were of no interest, inappropriate, or too difficult for a moderately retarded-type population. The questions that were retained were arranged in a preliminary order; and some of the items were reworded to eliminate possible ambiguities.

Described next are examples of these changes. For each change an example of the question used by Lambert is provided, followed by an explanation of why changes were made, and then the final wording of the altered question.

1) Questions of No Interest

a) In the morning, are you able to use the bathroom whenever you want?

b) Who is your boss?

These questions were eliminated because the information they would have provided was not germane to the variables identified and hence to the purposes of this study.

2) Inappropriate Questions

a) Have you ever had trouble with the police or been arrested?

b) About how much money do you get each week, month?

The information requested in questions of this type is of a particularly sensitive nature. It was felt that such information was unnecessary for the present study.

3) Difficult Questions

a) Do you think you have enough training for a job you would like to do?

b) How do you think the training programme should change?

The words and concepts in these two questions were considered to be beyond the ability of a moderately retarded adult; and hence

would not be understood. Therefore, these questions were also omitted.

4) Ambiguous Wording in Questions

a) Do you usually cook breakfast or does someone make it for you?

b) Do you take care of your own money or does someone take care of it for you?

Although grammatically correct, it was felt that the form of these questions would tend to confuse the moderately retarded adults. Instead, a simple, more straightforward Yes-No format followed by probing was felt to be more understandable. Therefore, questions such as these were reworded as follows:

a) Do you make/cook any of your own meals?
Yes _____
No _____
If Yes - Which meals do you make?
If No - Who makes the meals for you?

b) Do you have your own bank account?
Yes _____
No _____
If Yes - Do you save any money?
If No - Who takes care of your money for you?

5) Clarification of Probes for Questioning

a) Where do you get your money from?
(multiple check; probe)
b) How often did you see them?
(Probe - How many times last month?)

In the questionnaire used by Lambert not all probes were as vague as the first example (a). The second example (b) of a

probe is similar to what was used in the present study. It should be noted that the differences shown below are not only in the probes used, but also in the wording of the questions.

a) Where does the money you live on each month come from?
(Probe - How did you get it?)

b) How often did you see/spend time with your good friends last week?
(Probe - How many times?)

6) Immediacy of Questions-

a) When you go out, do you take a bus/streetcar/subway?

b) Do you have any spending money for yourself each week?

These questions were altered (see below) so that the subject was asked to recall the activities of the last week rather than an unspecified time period. It was felt that working in more concrete terms, i.e., events of the last week, would be more easily and accurately remembered.

a) When you went out this past week, how did you travel?)
(Probe - What are some of the ways you went different places?)

b) Did you have any spending money this last week?
(Probe - Did you have some money to buy things this last week?)

7) Clarity of Branching

a) Do you have any spending money for yourself each week?

_____ 1 Yes _____ 2 No

(If No)

b) Why not?

(If Yes)

c) About how much?

Questions like these require branching; the interviewer must be clear about what is to be asked next, given a particular answer. To facilitate this occurring, the branching instructions were made more specific, as illustrated in the following example:

17. Did you have any spending money this week?
(Probe - Did you have some money to buy things this last week?)
Yes _____ (Go to question 18)
No _____ (Go to question 19)

18. If Yes-
a) Who decided how much money you could have for the week?

19. If No-
Why didn't you have any spending money this last week?

8) Length of Questionnaire

During the development of the questionnaire there was a concern that, due to the length of the questionnaire, subjects would either become fatigued, distracted, or otherwise less co-operative. The best estimate of time over which such behaviour would not occur was one hour. Thus, the total number of questions was set so that an interview, including the introduction and completion, could be completed in one hour. A copy of the questionnaire, including the introductory statements, used in the pilot study is provided in Appendix B.

Pilot Study

The pilot study was conducted with four subjects to determine if the interview could be completed within the one hour time period and to identify difficulties with the questions. Two moderately retarded adults, known to the principal investigator, were interviewed. One adult had graduated from a school for the moderately retarded in 1977, while the other had graduated in 1979. Given the limited number of one and three year graduates, the subjects for the pilot study were taken from preceeding years' graduates (two and four years ago).

The two interviews with the subject and their respective parents/guardians took place at the subjects' residences.

The third and fourth interviews were done with role playing

models. The two role players, who volunteered their help, were graduate students in Special Education at the University of British Columbia. Both had extensive previous experience working with mentally handicapped persons.

The four interviews were conducted by the principal investigator. Audio tapes of each were made to provide a cross check of responses recorded in written form by the principal investigator during the interview. This was important to ensure accuracy and completeness of information collected. These data were used to examine each item in terms of the eight categories for change identified above.

No changes were made due to no interest, inappropriateness, difficulty, ambiguity, or immediacy. There was also no change required in the length of the interview-prompt recording sheet. The interview-prompt recording sheet could be completed in 40 minutes, well within the desired 60 minute time limit.

The data showed the need for some changes in the interview-prompt recording sheet. Described below are examples of changes made.

1) Additional Probes

   a) How long did you go to school?

      (Probe Added - How old were you when you started school?

      How old were you when you finished school?)

   b) Which city/town do you live in now?

(Probe Added - What is your address? Where do you live in British Columbia?)

2) Instructions

Instructions were added to clarify that it was not always necessary to ask a certain question.

a) If subject does not travel independently, Question 9 should not be asked.

Following the procedures outlined above, the final form of the interview-prompt recording sheet (a copy of which is presented in Appendix C), consisted of 47 questions organized into the following six sections:

I Demographic Information
Questions 1-7

II Mobility Independence
Questions 8-9

III Self-Sufficiency
Questions 10-19

IV Interaction Level
Questions 20-40

V Vocational Ability
Questions 41-44

VI Educational Status
Questions 45-47

CHAPTER 4

Methodology

Described in this chapter are the specific procedures used to examine the community adjustment of the moderately retarded adults interviewed for this study. First, the procedures used to identify potential subjects are described. This is followed by a description of the data collection procedures. Lastly, the data analysis procedures are presented and discussed.

Population

The population of interest in this study consisted of the males and females living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia who graduated in June, 1978 and June, 1980 from schools designated for the trainable mentally retarded.

Using the 1976 Vancouver Census Metropolitan (Statistics Canada, 1978) the lower mainland refers to an area consisting of the District of Burnaby, District of Coquitlam, District of Delta, Village of Lions Bay, City of New Westminster, City of North Vancouver, District of North Vancouver, City of Port Coquitlam, City of Port Moody, Township of Richmond, District of Surrey, City of Vancouver, District of West Vancouver, City of White Rock, Electoral Areas A (University Endowment Lands), B (Ioco-Buntzen), C (Bowen Island), City of Langley, District of Langley, District of Maple Ridge and District of Pitt Meadows.

The subjects graduated from one of eleven different schools for the trainable mentally retarded in nine school districts. These schools and school districts were:

1) Annieville - School District No. 37 (Delta)
2) Arthur Peake - School District No. 42 (Maple Ridge)
3) Crestwood - School District No. 38 (Richmond)
4) Donald Paterson - School District No. 41 (Burnaby)
5) George Greenaway - School District No. 36 (Surrey)
6) Simon Cunningham - School District No. 36 (Surrey)
7) Prince Charles - School District No. 44 (North Vancouver)
8) Sunny Cedars - School District No. 43 (Coquitlam)
9) Sunny Park - School District No. 43 (Coquitlam)
10) Oakridge - School District No. 39 (Vancouver)
11) Tillicum - School District No. 35 (Langley)

Identification and Selection of Subjects

The process of identifying potential subjects for the study was begun in September, 1981. At that time a letter explaining the research project and supporting documents (see Appendix D) was mailed to each of two schools, four school districts, five associations for the mentally retarded, one sheltered workshop, and a vocational placement agency for the mentally handicapped.

Names of potential subjects were obtained from two of the eleven schools - Arthur Peake and Crestwood; four of the nine school districts - Langley, Delta, Coquitlam, and North

Vancouver; three associations for the mentally retarded - Burnaby, Vancouver-Richmond, and Surrey; one sheltered workshop - Surrey Rehabilitation Workshop; and a vocational placement agency for the mentally handicapped - Polaris.

Nine of the eleven cooperating agencies sent the names of potential subjects directly to the principal investigator, who in turn contacted the subjects. Two of the school districts made their own contacts with potential subjects. One sent only the names of people who agreed to take part in the study. The other contacted their former students and allowed them to decide if they wanted to contact the principal investigator (this was done for reasons of confidentiality).

The final list of potential subjects contained 29 male and 19 female graduates in 1978 and 15 male and 21 female graduates in 1980. Because of the relatively small number of people identified, it was apparent that a random sampling of this population was not reasonable. The decision was made to interview as many of the identified subjects as possible during the data collection period of November, 1981 to March, 1982. It was determined that there would be 20 subjects for 1978 and 1980 respectively. It was also determined that the distribution would be 10 male and 10 female subjects in each of the years. If this number of subjects was not reached during the interview period, interviews would continue until the minimum number was reached.

Data Collection Procedures

Preparation for Data Collection

A letter (see Appendix E)in which the research project was described and a request for participation was made, was mailed to each potential subject and his/her parent guardian. Because most of the potential subjects could not read, the letter asked the parent/guardian to further explain the research project to the potential subject.

Two consent forms were included with each letter, one for the potential subject, and one for the parent/guardian (see Appendix E). A stamped self-addressed envelope was also provided.

If the consent forms were not returned within a three week period, a follow-up letter (see Appendix E) was sent to ask the potential subject and his/her parent/guardian to participate in the study. Initial experience revealed that this procedure was ineffective. Consequently, the mail follow-up was replaced by a telephone follow-up. Telephone calls were made to those persons who had not returned their consent forms within the three week period. During the phone call an appointment for an interview was made if the potential subject and/or his/her parent/guardian agreed to participate. Phone calls were also made to set up interviews with those people who had already returned their consent forms and agreed to participate.

Follow-up was done by three of the cooperating agencies

when there was little or no response to the initial letter. This proved to be most helpful in increasing the response rate.

Interview Procedure

The interviews were conducted by the principal investigator following the same format as in the pilot study and using the interview-prompt recording sheet (see Appendix C).

Forty of the 44 interviews took place at the residences of each of the subjects. Of the four remaining interviews, two took place in a local MR Association office, one in a sheltered workshop and one in a parent's house.

It was felt that it was important to have a parent, relative, or other appropriate individual present or nearby during the interview. This was to insure both accuracy of information and the security of the subject. All interviews, but one, were conducted in this way. In one case the subject was interviewed in the presence of another resident of the group home. The parent was later contacted to provide information that was not obtained from the subject during the interview.

With the exception of four interviews, all were audio taped to provide a check of responses recorded in written form by the principal investigator during the interview. In this way accuracy was ensured. The reasons for not recording the four interviews were:

1) Permission for two of the interviews was given only if there

was no tape recorder being used;

2) Two subjects were upset with the presence of the tape recorder.

Data Analysis Procedures

Coding of Data

The procedures used to code the data from the three types of questions found in the interview-prompt recording sheet are reported in this section. The numerical codes and their meanings are presented in Appendix F.

The first type of question asked required a forced-choice response. In this type of question the responses were exhaustive and mutually exclusive. A numerical code was assigned to each response category (Orlich, 1978).

The second type of question involved a multiple-choice format, with more than one response permitted.

The last type of question asked was the open-ended response. Unlike either forced-choice or multiple-choice questions, categories for open-ended response questions are developed after the data is gathered and completed. As mentioned above, the development of the categories used is described in Appendix F.

The coding of the data on occupational status (highest skill level ever obtained in any job) was done using the

Vocational Check List of the Adaptive Functioning Index (Marlett, 1973). The information was classified and coded according to the five skill levels defined in the Vocational Check List (see Appendix F).

Data Preparation

The coded data were keypunched with 100% verification. The listing of the computer file was then compared against the original coding and interview-prompt recording sheet for each subject to ensure accuracy. No keypunching errors were found; 29 coding errors were found. This represents an error rate of .26%, well within the limits of the one percent normally associated with large surveys employing similar types of questionnaires. All errors were corrected.

Statistical Analysis

For each variable, the frequency distribution for male and female graduates from each of 1978 and 1980 were prepared and compared using the 2 X 2 (year-by-gender) chi-square statistic. Only those chi-squares with sufficient cell size were examined for differences. Given the exploratory nature of the investigation, the .05 level of significance was used. All analyses were completed using the Crosstabs option of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, & Bent, 1975) and the Amdahl 470 maintained by the Computing Centre at the University of British Columbia.

Chapter 5

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The purpose of the present study was to describe the current status of moderately retarded adults living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, one and three years after they have graduated from school, in terms of their mobility indpendence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status.

The results of the frequency analyses conducted to meet this purpose are reported in this chapter. These results are reported in six major sections: a section for the demographic data, and a section for each of the five components of community adjustment.

The results of the chi-square analysis revealed that for each component of community adjustment, the distribution for males and females within and between 1978 and 1980 were not significantly different ($p<.05$). Therefore, the results are reported in a descriptive manner and in terms of the cell and marginal frequencies and percentages for gender and year. The chi-square values are not reported.

Demographic Description

Response Rate

Table 1
Response Rate
1978

	Male	Female	Total
Potential Subjects	24	15	39
No Answer	2	--	2
Contacted but did not Participate	8	5	13
Interviewed	14	10	24
Excluded	1	--	1
Number of Subjects in 1978 Group	13	10	23

As shown in Table 1, 24 males and 15 females were identified as potential subjects in the 1978 group. Of the 24 potential male subjects, two did not respond to the initial letters. In these two cases it was assumed contact was made because the post office did not return any of the initial letters. Another eight males and five females were contacted or they contacted the principal investigator to say they did not want to participate in the study. Finally, one male was excluded after being interviewed when it was found out he graduated from a school in 1977 and not 1978. As a result 13 males and 10 females were interviewed. The 1978 group had a response rate of 63.9% (61.9% for males, and 66.7% for females).

Table 2
Response Rate
1980

	Male	Female	Total
Potential Subjects	14	20	34
No Answer	2	2	2
Contacted but did not Participate	3	7	10
Interviewed	9	11	20
Excluded	--	--	--
Number of Subjects in 1980 Group	9	11	20

Table 2 shows that 14 males and 20 females were identified as potential subjects in the 1980 group. Using the same procedures described above nine males and 11 females were interviewed in the 1980 group. The 1980 group had a response rate of 62.5% (75% for males, and 61.1% for females).

Dominant Source of Information

Forty-two of the 43 interviews were conducted with the mentally handicapped subject and his/her parent/guardian present or nearby. Table 3 shows that more than half (seven) of the 1978 males were able to provide most of the information in the interview themselves. Two males and their parents/guardians provided the information together, and four males had their parents/guardians provide most of the information; this included two non-verbal subjects. Four of the 1978 females provided the requested information themselves. Of the remaining six females, two subjects and their parents/guardians provided the

information together and four parents/guardians provided the information for the remaining four females.

Table 3
Dominant Source of Information
Gender by Year

	Source			
Year/Gender	Subject	Subject & Parent/Guardian	Parent/Guardian	Total
1978				
Male	7	2	4	13
Female	4	2	4	10
1980				
Male	3	3	3	9
Female	5	3	3	11

Table 3 also shows that the 1980 males were evenly divided with three of the interviews falling into each of the three sources of information. The parent/guardian category included information from two non-verbal males. Five 1980 females provided most of the information themselves. Of the remaining six females in this group, three subjects and their parents/guardians provided the information together and three parents/guardians provided the information in the rest.

Gender

The 1978 group consisted of 13 males (56.5%) and 10 females (43.5%) (see Table 4). For 1980, the corresponding distribution

was nine males (45.0%) and 11 females (55.0%).

Table 4
Frequencies and Percentages
Gender by Year

	Male		Female		Group Total
	N	%	N	%	N
1978	13	56.5	10	43.5	23
1980	9	45.0	11	55.0	20
Total	22	51.2	21	48.8	43

Age

The age distribution and mean ages are shown in Table 5 for each year and gender group. The age range for 1978 males was 21 to 24, with a mean of 22.8 years; for the 1978 females, the age range was 18 to 23 with a mean of 21.3 years. The mean age of the 1978 group was 22.1 years. The 1980 males range in age from 21 to 23 years, with a mean of 21.7 years. The age range for the 1980 females was 19 to 22, with a mean of 20.8 years. The mean age of the 1980 group was 21.2 years.

Table 5
Age Distribution
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
Age/Gender	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
18	-	1	1	-	-	-
19	-	-	-	-	1	1
20	-	2	2	-	2	2
21	1	2	3	4	6	10
22	3	2	5	4	2	6
23	7	3	10	1	-	1
24	2	-	2	-	-	-
Mean Age	22.8	21.3	22.1	21.7	20.8	21.2

An examination of the mean age of the 1978 and 1980 groups reveals that the difference between them is .9 years rather than the 2 years that would be expected. An explanation can be found in Table 6. It shows that the 1978 group left school at an earlier age than the 1980 group, i.e., 11 (47.8%) subjects in the 1978 group left school at age 19 or younger; this includes a 1978 female who left school at the age of 15. Only three (15%) subjects in the 1980 group left school at the age of 19 or younger.

Table 6
Age at Graduation
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
Age/Gender	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
15	-	1	1	-	-	-
16	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	-	2	2	-	-	-
18	1	2	3	-	1	1
19	3	2	5	-	2	2
20	7	3	10	4	6	10
21	2	-	2	4	2	6
22	-	-	-	1	-	1

Education

As indicated in Chapter 4, the subjects could have graduated from one of 11 different schools in the Lower Mainland area. Table 7 shows, for each year and gender group, the names of the schools and the number of males and females that graduated from each school in this study. The largest number of graduates in 1978 (six - five males and one female) were from Oakridge School. Donald Paterson was next with four graduates, all female. Prince Charles and Tillicum had three graduates each (one male and two females).

Table 7 also shows the same type of information for the 1980 graduates. The largest number (seven - five males and two females) came from Prince Charles; while Oakridge was next with six graduates (three males and three females). Annieville,

Arthur Peake, and George Greenaway had one female graduate each. Sunny Park was the only school from which no graduates were interviewed.

Table 7
School of Graduation
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
School/Gender	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Annieville	-	-	-	-	1	1
Arthur Peake	1	-	1	-	1	1
Crestwood	1	1	2	-	-	-
Donald Paterson	-	4	4	-	-	-
George Greenaway	-	-	-	-	1	1
Oakridge	5	1	6	3	3	6
Prince Charles	1	2	3	5	2	7
Simon Cunningham	2	0	2	1	1	2
Sunny Cedars	2	0	2	1	1	2
Sunny Park	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tillicum	1	-	1	-	-	-
Total	13	10	23	9	11	20

Table 8 shows the number of years subjects attended the school from which they graduated. The 1978 group attended their schools of graduation for a period of two to fifteen years. The mean time at these schools was 9.0 years. The 1980 group were at their schools of graduation for a period of seven to sixteen years. The 1980 group spent a mean time of 12.6 years at these schools.

Table 8
Number of Years in
School of Graduation
Gender by Year

Years/Gender	1978 Male	1978 Female	1978 Total	1980 Male	1980 Female	1980 Total
3	-	2	2	-	-	-
4	1	-	1	-	-	-
5	2	-	2	-	-	-
6	4	-	4	-	-	-
7	1	-	1	-	1	1
9	-	2	2	1	-	1
10	1	1	2	1	-	1
11	-	-	-	1	1	2
12	-	1	1	1	-	1
13	-	2	2	2	4	6
14	1	1	2	-	4	4
15	3	1	4	2	-	2
16	-	-	-	1	-	1
Mean Years	8.2	10.1	9.0	12.7	12.6*	12.6

*Data for one subject was missing, therefore the mean was calculated with an n=10.

Thirteen subjects attended more than one school. As shown in Table 9, 12 were 1978 graduates, while only one 1980 graduate (a female) attended a school other than the one from which she graduated. Table 8 also shows the 1978 group attended other schools for a period of two to ten years. The mean time was 6.7 years. The one 1980 subject attended another school for eight years.

Table 9
Number of Years in
Other Schools
Gender by Year

Years/Gender	1978 Male	1978 Female	1978 Total	1980 Male*	1980 Female**	1980 Total
2	1	-	1	-	-	-
3	-	-	-	-	-	-
4	-	1	1	-	-	-
5	1	-	1	-	-	-
6	1	2	3	-	-	-
7	-	1	1	-	-	-
8	2	-	2	-	1	1
9	1	-	1	-	-	-
10	2	-	2	-	-	-
Number of Subjects	8	4	12	0	1	1
Mean Years	7.3	5.7	6.7	-	8.0	8.0

*No males in the 1980 group attended other school programmes.
**Data for one subject was missing.

Although not shown in Table 9, the data reveal that twelve 1978 subjects attended a wide variety of schools in the Lower Mainland area and other provinces in Canada. The 1980 subjects attended a school in the Lower Mainland area.

Location of Residence

Table 10 shows the ten cities and districts the 1978 group lived in. The largest number of subjects (five - four males and one female) lived in Vancouver. There were three subjects each in Burnaby, Langley, and North Vancouver. There was one subject

each in Richmond, White Rock, and Maple Ridge.

The 1980 group lived in eight cities and districts in the Lower Mainland area (see Table 10). The largest number of subjects lived in Vancouver (six - five males and one female) and North Vancouver (six - three males and three females). There was one subject each in Delta, West Vancouver, and Maple Ridge.

Table 10
Location of Residence
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
City/Gender	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Burnaby	-	3	3	-	-	-
Coquitlam	2	-	2	1	1	2
Delta	1	1	2	-	1	1
Langley	1	2	3	-	-	-
Maple Ridge	1	-	1	-	1	1
New Westminster	-	-	-	-	-	-
North Vancouver	1	2	3	5	1	6
Port Coquitlam	-	-	-	-	-	-
Port Moody	-	-	-	-	-	-
Richmond	1	-	1	-	-	-
Surrey	1	1	2	-	3	3
Vancouver	4	2	6	3	3	6
West Vancouver	-	-	-	-	1	1
White Rock	1	-	-	-	-	-
Total	13	10	23	9	11	20

Marital Status

All subjects in the study were single.

Living Arrangements

Table 11 shows that seven (53.8%) of the 1978 males lived with their parents. Of the six 1978 males not living with their parents, one was living with his brothers, three were living in group homes, one was living in a residential institution, and one was living on a farm. Six (60%) of the 1978 females lived with their parents. Of the four 1978 females not living with their parents, one was living with her friends, one was living in a group home, one was living in a foster home, and one was living on a farm. Thirteen (56.5%) subjects in the 1978 group lived with their parents, ten (43.5%) did not live with their parents.

Table 11
Frequency and Percentage of
Living Arrangements, 1978

Living with Parents			Not Living with Parents							
			Other Relatives		Friends		Group Home		Other*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	7	53.8	1	7.7	-	--	3	23.1	2	15.4
Female	6	60.0	-	--	1	10.0	1	10.0	2	20.0
Total	13	56.5	1	4.3	1	4.3	1	17.4	4	17.4

*Includes a farm, residential institution and foster home.

Table 12 shows that five (55.6%) of the 1980 males lived with their parents. The four 1980 males not living with their parents were living in group homes. Eight (72.7%) of the 1980 females lived with their parents. Of the three 1980 females not living with their parents, two were living in group homes and one was living on a farm. Thirteen (65%) of the subjects in the 1980 group lived with their parents; seven (35%) did not live with their parents.

Table 12
Frequency and Percentage of Living Arrangements, 1980

Living with Parents			Not Living with Parents							
			Other Relatives		Friends		Group Home		Other*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	5	55.6	-	---	-	---	4	44.4	-	---
Female	8	72.7	-	---	-	---	2	18.2	1	9.1
Total	13	65.0	-	---	-	---	6	30.0	1	5.0

*Includes a farm.

Table 13 shows the number of years that the subjects spent in their living arrangements. The 1978 and 1980 groups spent a mean time of 13.7 and 14.8 years, respectively, in their living arrangements.

Table 13
Years in
Living Arrangement
Gender by Year

Years/Gender	1978 Male	1978 Female	1978 Total	1980 Male	1980 Female	1980 Total
.25	-	1	1	-	-	-
.50	1	-	1	1	-	1
1.00	-	-	-	1	2	3
1.50	1	2	3	-	-	-
2.00	-	1	1	-	-	-
2.50	-	-	-	-	1	1
3.00	2	-	2	-	-	-
5.00	-	-	-	1	-	1
7.00	1	-	1	-	-	-
9.00	1	-	1	-	-	-
10.00	-	-	-	1	-	1
12.00	-	1	1	-	-	-
19.00	-	-	-	-	1	1
20.00	-	-	-	-	1	1
21.00	-	1	1	2	3	5
22.00	1	2	3	3	3	6
23.00	4	2	6	-	-	-
24.00	2	-	2	-	-	-
Mean Years	14.3	12.8	13.7	13.8	15.7	14.9

A further analysis was done on the data presented in Tables 11, 12, and 13. This was done to look at the stability of the subjects' living arrangements. The mean number of years for the subjects, in the 1978 and 1980 groups, living and not living with their parents, is shown in Table 14. The subjects in the 1978 group lived with their parents a mean of 21.9 years. Those who did not live with their parents did so for a mean of 2.9 years. The subjects in the 1980 group lived with their parents a mean of 21.1 years. The 1980 subjects who did not live with their parents did so for a mean of 3 years.

Table 14
Mean Years In Living Arrangement
Gender by Year

	Living with Parents	Not Living with Parents
1978	21.9	2.9
1980	21.1	3.0

In terms of the stability of their living arrangements the subjects were well settled. In both the 1978 and 1980 groups more than half the subjects (13 in each) still lived with their parents after leaving school.

It should also be noted that the results here were consistent with Lambert's (1976) findings in that those subjects living with their parents were in their living arrangements a long time; while those subjects not living with their parents were in their living arrangements a short time.

In the next part of Chapter 5 a description of the 1978 and 1980 subjects' community adjustment in terms of their mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status is presented. Within each of the five sections there is also a discussion of the findings.

Mobility Independence

Educational programmes for the moderately retarded have put an increasing emphasis on the acquisition of a wide variety of functional skills. Examples include being able to travel in the community, preparing meals, carrying out home management tasks (cleaning, making beds, doing laundry), handling money, interacting with people in an appropriate manner, and having work skills. The development of these skills to the fullest extent possible of each of these students is essential for a useful and independent life in the community.

The data in this section provide information on the extent to which the mentally retarded adults travelled in their community. This was indicated by the forms and frequency of transportation used, the destinations travelled to, the supervision required when using the transportation, and the frequency and reasons for getting lost.

a) Form of Transportation and Frequency of Use

Tables 15 and 16 summarize the forms of transportation and the frequency of use of that transportation by the 1978 and 1980 groups.

Table 15
Form of Transportation and Frequency of Use, 1978

	Car (family, friends, staff drive		B.C. Hydro Bus		Easter Seal Bus, Van, Handidart		Other	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Once	4	2	1	1	-	-	1*	-
Twice	1	3	-	1	-	1	-	-
Three times	2	1	-	-	-	-	1**	-
three times	3	1	3	2	4	3	-	-
Everyday	-	1	5	1	-	-	-	-
Total	10	8	9	5	4	5	2	-

*One 1978 male took a taxi
**One 1978 male walked

Table 16
Form of Transportation and Frequency of Use, 1980

	Car (family, friends, staff drive		B.C. Hydro Bus		Easter Seal Bus, Van, Handidart		Other	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Once	2	2	1	1	-	-	1*	1*
Twice	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Three times	1	-	-	1	-	1	-	-
three times	1	3	2	2	3	3	-	-
Everyday	2	4	2	1	-	-	-	-
Total	8	10	5	5	3	4	1	1

*One 1980 male and female walked

The main form of transportation used by both groups was a car driven by family members, friends, or group home staff. Eighteen subjects in both the 1978 groups and 1980 groups used this form of transportation. Within the 18 subjects in both groups, six 1978 subjects (four males and two females) travelled in a car once a week while six 1980 subjects (two males and four females) travelled in a car every day. The difference in the frequency of use of a car driven by others indicates that the subjects participated in activities with their families or other residents of group homes, and as such travelled together. Those subjects living in rural areas like Langley where there was less accessible public transportation, would be drivin in the family car more often.

The second most frequently used form of transportation was the B.C. Hydro bus. Those subjects that used the Hydro bus tended to do so often. Five 1978 subjects (three males and two females) used the Hydro bus more than three times a week and six 1978 subjects (five males and one female) used the bus every day. Four 1980 subjects (two males and two females) used the Hydro bus more than three times a week and three 1980 subjects (two males and one female) used the bus every day. The data on the 1978 group show that more males than females used the bus. In the 1980 group only one more male than female used the bus.

The third most frequent form of transportation used was the Easter Seal bus, HandiDart, or group home van/bus. Seven 1978 subjects (four males and three females) and six 1980 subjects

(three males and three females) used this form of transportation more than three times a week. The majority of subjects using this form of transportation were not able to travel independently.

Under the category of other forms of transportation, one 1978 male took a taxi home, while one 1978 male walked to work (three times). In the 1980 group, one male walked to a recreation/social activity and one female walked to the hairdresser near their respective homes.

No subjects reported they rode a bicycle or drove a car by themselves.

b) Destinations

The destinations to which subjects travelled are reported as they relate to the forms of transportation described above. Because of the small number of subjects and the large number of destinations, it was not practical to report these data for gender and year. The data are, therefore, reported in terms of all 43 subjects in the study.

Subjects who travelled in cars driven by family members, friends or group home staff primarily went to the following:

1) Recreation/Social Activities, e.g., visited friends and relatives, went bowling, swimming, ice skating, saw movies, played bingo, and went to parties.
2) Shopping, e.g., bought groceries, clothes, presents, and a Christmas tree

3) Work, e.g., workshop, restaurant, factory, farm

Other destinations included restaurants, church, and barber or hairdresser.

The list of places/activities were very suitable for a subject in a family or a resident of a group home to participate in together. These were also reasons why the subjects in the 1980 group drove in a car every day.

Subjects using the B.C. Hydro bus primarily went to the following:

1) Work
2) Recreation/Social Activities
3) Shopping

Other destinations included restaurants, church, and barber or hairdresser.

Subjects using the Easter Seal bus, HandiDart, or group home van/bus most often went to the following:

1) Work
2) Recreation/Social Activities
3) Shopping

Other destinations included school and home.

Table 17
Levels of Supervision on Transportation
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Supervised	4	5	9	4	6	10
Supervised -Unsupervised	6	3	9	4	5	9
Unsupervised	3	2	5	1	-	1
Total	13	10	23	9	11	20

c) Supervision

Table 17 shows the number of subjects in each group that travelled only in supervised transportation (car, Easter Seal bus, HandiDart, etc.), a combination of supervised and unsupervised transportation, or only in unsupervised transportation. The data show that the subjects in both groups were quite evenly divided between the use of supervised transportation only and a combination of supervised and unsupervised transportation. The number of subjects in the second category reflected the fact that subjects used the B.C. Hydro bus Monday to Friday to go to work and on the weekend travelled with their parents to go visting, shopping, or to church.

A further analysis of the data showed that eight subjects (five males and three females) needed no help in using the bus

in their communities. The data showed the same for six 1980 subjects (three males and three females). Another five subjects (four males and two females) in the 1978 group and three subjects (one male and two females) in the 1980 group could travel independently but travelled with friends on the bus. One subject in each group needed some supervision to travel on the bus. Subjects who needed a lot of supervision did not travel on the public transportation system.

d) Getting Lost

The 14 subjects in the 1978 group and the ten subjects in the 1980 group who used public transportation system did so with considerable success, in that none reported getting lost.

A summary of the findings on mobility independence show that the males and females in the 1978 and 1980 groups were able to travel quite extensively in their communities. The 1978 subjects travelled in cars driven by family, friends, or group home staff less often than the 1980 subjects. Also more 1978 subjects used the public transportation system more often than the 1980 subjects. Subjects from both groups who travelled in the Easter Seal bus, HandiDart, or group home van/bus tended to be more dependent than the other subjects.

The findings here cannot provide definitive answers but do lead to speculation on the differences between the 1978 and 1980 groups. One might speculate that the differences may be due to the skill level of the subjects or that mobility independence

improves over a period of time. The differences between males and females are also worthy of consideration. One may speculate that there is a skill level difference in favor of males or that males are not as protected as females and thus have less mobility independence.

Self-Sufficiency

The ability to travel independently in the community is just one of the many skills needed by the moderately retarded adults to live useful and independent lives. Ideally these moderately retarded adults will also be competent looking after themselves by making meals, cleaning their houses, washing their clothes and handling their money to buy the things they want.

The data presented in this section provide information about the ability of subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups to look after themselves in terms of preparation of meals (frequency and degree of difficulty), carrying out home management tasks (cleaning, making beds, doing laundry), and handling money (degree of control and kinds of things bought).

a) Preparation of Meals

Table 18
Frequencies and Percentages of Subjects Cooking Meals
Gender by Year

	Male		Female		Group Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	
1978	9	69.2	9	90.0	18	78.3
1980	8	88.9	10	90.9	18	90.0
Total	17	77.3	19	90.5	36	83.7

Table 18 shows that 18 subjects (78.3%) in the 1978 group and 18 subjects (90%) in the 1980 group cooked at least one of their own meals a minimum of once a week.

A more specific indicator of self-sufficiency in preparation of meals is the frequency with which the subjects cooked their own meals. In the 1978 group six (four males and two females) out of 14 subjects cooked breakfast every day; six (two males and four females) out of 12 subjects cooked their lunch every day; four (two males and two females) out of four subjects cooked their supper every day; and seven (three males and four females) out of ten subjects made their snack every day.

In the 1980 group, 11 (six males and five females) out of 15 subjects cooked their breakfast every day; four (three males and one female) out of ten subjects cooked their lunch every day; three (one male and two females) out of eight cooked their

supper every day; and six (three males and three females) out of 11 subjects made their snack every day. Overall, the meal most often cooked was breakfast and the meal least often cooked was supper. The data show this was the same for both males and females as well as those living with and not living with their parents.

With some understanding of how often meals were prepared it was also necessary to find out the level of skills used in the preparation of these meals.

The type of food made for each meal was put into one of three skill level categories. The three categories were arranged so as to show tasks that went from least to most complex (see Appendix F). Tables 19 and 20 summarize the meals made and the category of skill used in their preparation for each group. Fourteen subjects in both the 1978 and 1980 groups made breakfast. Within the 14 subjects, nine (six males and three females) in the 1978 group and seven (four males and three females) in the 1980 group were in category 2 for the preparation of breakfast indicating that the subjects were able to use pots/pans and a stove to make things like eggs, pancakes, french toast, coffee and tea. Seven (two males and five females) out of 12 subjects in the 1978 group and five (three males and two females) out of ten subjects in the 1980 group were in category 1 for the preparation of lunch, indicating that these subjects did not use pots/pans and a stove. Subjects in category 1 made things like sandwiches, or ate raw vegetables

and fruits, cottage cheese, and cookies. Two (one male and one female) out of four subjects in the 1978 group were in each of categories 2 and 3 and five (four females and one male) out of eight subjects were in category 3 for the preparation of supper, indicating these subjects cooked things like weiners and beans, hamburgers, soup, macaroni, and vegetables or combinations of these kinds of foods. Eight (four males and four females) out of ten subjects in the 1978 group were in category 1 and seven (one male and six females) out of 11 subjects in the 1980 group were in category 2 for the preparation of snacks. The 1978 subjects ate things like cookies but also had tea, coffee, or hot chocolate.

Table 19
Skill Level Used in Preparation of Meals
1978

		Breakfast	Lunch	Supper	Snack
Category 1	Male	1	2	-	4
	Female	3	5	-	4
Category 2	Male	6	2	1	1
	Female	3	2	1	1
Category 3	Male	-	1	1	-
	Female	1	-	1	-
Total		14	12	4	10

Table 20
Skill Level Used in Preparation of Meals
1980

		Breakfast	Lunch	Supper	Snack
Category 1	Male	3	3	-	3
	Female	2	2	-	1
Category 2	Male	4	2	1	1
	Female	3	2	2	6
Category 3	Male	-	-	1	-
	Female	2	1	4	-
Total		14	10	8	11

Tables 19 and 20 also show that four subjects (two males and two females) in the 1978 group and eight subjects (one male and 7 females) in the 1980 group were in category 3.

The data on frequency and skill level of meal preparation together show that the subjects in both groups who cook tended to cook meals every day and cook these meals at a category 2 level indicating they used pots/pans and a stove. The frequency and skill level of meal preparation was the same for those living with their parents as those not living with their parents.

There were six subjects (five males[1] and one female) in the

1978 group and two subjects (one male and one female) in the 1980 group who did not cook. The reasons given were: do not know how, do not want to, not allowed, and all cooking done by a kitchen staff.

One 1978 female and two 1980 males were able to do all their own cooking. There were also 16 subjects in each group who did not cook all their own meals every day. The subjects' sources of help in this area were considered as indicators of their self-sufficiency.

The persons who cooked meals depended on where the subjects lived. Table 21 shows the who cooked for the subjects in both groups. The largest number of subjects, 14 (seven males and seven females) in the 1978 group and 13 (five males and eight females) in the 1980 group had their meals cooked by their mothers and fathers. Seven subjects in the 1978 group and the one subject in the 1980 group had their meals made by the group home staff. In a few of the larger group homes supper, during the week, was made by a person who was hired as a cook. The category 'Other' included a wide variety of people (e.g., brothers, other residents, and paid staff) who helped cook in group homes.

---

[1]In question 10, four 1978 males indicated that they did not cook their own meals. In question 11, when asked if they knew how to cook, one male who did not cook any meals indicated he knew how and two other males who were able to make snacks occasionally were in fact not able to cook, hence the change from four to five males in the 1978 group.

Table 21
Persons Who Cooked for Subjects
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Mother/Father	7	7*	14	5	8	13
Paid Staff (Cook)	6	2	7	1	-	1
Other**	1	-	1	1	3	4
Total	13	9	22	7	11	18

*Includes a female living in a foster home.
**Includes help from brother, other residents, and paid staff

Subjects were also asked if they helped to make any meals. The data showed that three males in the 1978 group and one female in the 1980 group who did not cook meals also did not help to prepare any meals.

Table 22
Type of Subjects' Help in Making Meals
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Table Preparation	5	2	7	1	4	5
Food Preparation	4	2	6	3	-	3
Food & Table Preparation	-	2	2	2	3	5
Other	1	2	3	-	2	2
Total	10	8	18	6	9	15

Table 22 shows the number of subjects in each group that did help make meals and the types of things they did to help. The largest number of subjects, seven (five males and two females) in the 1978 group and five (one male and four females) in the 1980 group helped with table preparation, i.e., setting the table and serving food. Six subjects in 1978 and three subjects in 1980 helped with food preparation, i.e., cut, mixed, peeled and stirred a wide variety of foods. This was followed by two 1978 subjects who did a combination of both table and food preparation. And finally three 1978 subjects and two 1980 subjects helped by clearing the table and doing some of the activities mentioned above.

In terms of helping to prepare meals the data show that 78.3% of the subjects in the 1978 group and 75% of the subjects in the 1980 group actively participated in some aspect of the

cooking process. This was especially noticeable for subjects who lived in group homes, where jobs like cutting up meat and vegetables or clearing the table were done on a rotation basis. There was also no noticeable difference between males and females in helping activities as there was for cooking.

b) Home Management Tasks

The reporting of the results in this section will follow the same format as preparation of meals.

Table 23
Frequencies and Percentages of Subjects
Doing Home Management Tasks
Gender by Year

	Male		Female		Group Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	
1978	12	92.3	10	100.0	22	95.6
1980	8	88.9	11	100.0	19	95.0
Total	20	90.9	21	100.0	42	95.3

Table 23 shows that 22 subjects (95.6%) in the 1978 group and 19 subjects (95%) in the 1980 group did at least one home management task a minimum of once a week.

The frequency of doing home management tasks was used to help indicate the self-sufficiency of the subjects in this area. Reported here are the five home management tasks done by the largest number of subjects in each group.

Table 24
Types of Home Management Tasks
and Frequency of Being Done, 1978

	Make beds		Wash/Dry Dishes		Vacuum/ Dust/ Sweep		Take out Garbage		Wash Clothes	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Once	-	-	2	2	7	4	5	-	4	3
Twice	-	1	2	1	1	1	-	1	1	-
Three times	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
three times	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Everyday	10	8	6	5	-	2	2	3	-	-
Total	10	9	10	9	8	8	8	5	5	3

Table 25
Types of Home Management Tasks
and Frequency of Being Done, 1980

	Make beds		Wash/Dry Dishes		Vacuum/ Dust/ Sweep		Take out Garbage		Wash Clothes	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Once	-	1	1	1	3	3	1	1	3	2
Twice	-	1	1	2	-	1	1	-	-	1
Three times	-	2	-	2	-	1	-	-	-	-
three times	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Everyday	8	7	3	5	-	3	2	1	3	-
Total	8	11	5	11	3	8	4	2	3	3

Tables 24 and 25 show that 19 subjects in each group made their beds. Within the 19 subjects in each group, eighteen 1978 subjects (ten males and eight females) and fifteen 1980 subjects

made their beds every day.

Washing/drying dishes was another task done by a large number of subjects. In the 1978 group 11 (out of 19) subjects and in the 1980 group eight (out of 16) subjects washed dishes every day.

Sixteen subjects in the 1978 group and 11 subjects in the 1980 group vacuumed or swept floors and dusted furniture. The largest number of subjects, 11 (seven males and four females) in the 1978 group and six (three males and three females) did these activities once a week.

The frequency of taking out garbage varied more than the tasks mentioned above. In the 1978 group five subjects (all males) took out garbage once a week and five others took it out every day. Three subjects in the 1980 group took out garbage every day.

Eight subjects in the 1978 group and six subjects in the 1980 group washed their clothes. Seven subjects (four males and three females) in the 1978 group and five subjects (three males and two females) washed their clothes once a week. The subjects that did this activity were responsible for putting laundry in or taking laundry out of the washing machine and/or dryer.

Other home management tasks done were: look after pets, clean the bathroom, and work in the garden. Individual subjects also helped carry wood or groceries, went to the store and brought in the paper.

The five home management tasks done by the subjects in each group are basic to keep any home clean and tidy. An interesting aspect of doing home management tasks was the frequency with which they were done. The majority of subjects in both groups made their beds, washed dishes and took out garbage every day; vacuumed or dusted, and washed clothes once a week. The data show that females in the 1978 and 1980 groups did not do more than the males in the two groups on home management tasks.

The skill level the subjects worked at in these activities was not determined. This was because taking out the garbage and washing the dishes were 'all or none' types of activities. Subjects were asked, however, if they knew how to do the five home management tasks. Table 26 shows the number of subjects in each group that knew how to do the five home management tasks. A comparison between the data in Tables 24 and 25 and Table 26 shows that the subjects who knew how to do the five home management tasks did do them.

Table 26
Subjects Knowing How to Do Home Management Tasks
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Make bed	11	9	20	8	11	19
Wash/Dry Dishes	11	10	21	8	11	19
Vacuum/ Dust/Sweep	10	9	19	7	11	18
Take out Garbage	10	8	18	8	10	18
Wash Clothes	5	6	11	6	5	11

One male in each group did not do any home management tasks. The 1978 male knew how to make a bed and wash dishes but was not expected to do any of them. The 1980 male reported that he did not know how to do any of the tasks.

All of the subjects in both groups, even the eight subjects (five males and three females) in the 1978 group and the three subjects (all female) in the 1980 group who did all five home management tasks, had other people in their homes help or do some tasks. Table 27 shows who did the home management tasks. The largest number of subjects, 13 (six males and seven females) in the 1978 group and 13 (five males and eight females) in the 1980 group had home management tasks done by their mothers and fathers. For the subjects living in group homes there was a number of people who did the work. Five subjects in the 1978 group and six subjects in the 1980 group had work done by the

group home staff and other residents.

Table 27
Persons Who Did Home Management Tasks For Subjects
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Mother/Father	6	7	13	5	8	13
Paid Staff	1	-	1	-	-	-
Other Residents	1	9	2	1	-	1
Paid Staff & Other Residents	3	2	5	3	3	6
Other*	2	-	2	-	-	-
Total	13	10	23	9	11	20

*Includes brothers, and mother and sister

The subjects were asked if they helped to do any home management tasks. The one male in each group did not do any tasks and also did not help. One other male in each group also did not help. All of the females in each group did help. The subjects who lived with their parents helped whenever they were needed to clean up, unload the dishwasher, and fold clothes. The subjects living in group situations did their home management tasks on a rotation basis. Jobs like vacuuming, washing dishes, and taking out garbage were each done by individuals for one week. The other residents in a group home were expected to help each other on a regular basis.

Overall the subjects in each group were quite proficient at

doing the five home management tasks. Five males and three females in the 1978 group were particularly proficient, in that they did all five tasks.

c) Handling Money

The data on this aspect of self-sufficiency provide information about the ability of subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups to control their own money in terms of source of income; presence of a bank account; payment of rent, groceries and clothes; decision on having spending money; and the kinds of things bought with money.

1) Source of Income

Table 28
Frequency and Percentage of Source of Income
Gender by Year

	1978						1980					
Source	Male		Female		Group Total		Male		Female		Group Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Government & Work	10	76.9	9	9.0	19	82.6	8	88.9	9	81.8	17	85
Other*	6	23.1	1	10.0	4	17.4	1	11.1	2	18.2	3	15
Total	13	100	10	100	23	100	9	100	11	100	20	100

*This category includes all other sources of income.

Table 28 shows that 19 (82.6%) of subjects in the 1978 group and 17 (85%) of subjects in the 1980 group received money

from the provincial government in the form of Guaranteed Available Income for Need (GAIN) and their place of employment. Other sources of income were from the government alone; parents and work; government, parents and work; and an inheritance.

No subject could live on the income from his/her job alone, and because of this the GAIN cheque each month was essential to the financial well-being of the majority of subjects.

2) Bank Account

Fifteen subjects (eight males and seven females) in the 1978 group and 13 subjects (five males and eight females) in the 1980 group had bank accounts. The reasons for more subjects not having bank accounts are two-fold. The first was that four subjects in the 1978 group and one subject in the 1980 group could not handle money. The second reason, mentioned by parents in four interviews, was that if subjects had above a certain sum of money the government would reduce the amount of the GAIN cheque each month. In order to avoid this parents looked after their childrens' money. This issue was not raised for subjects in either group living in group homes.

Those who indicated they had a bank account were asked if they saved money. Fifteen subjects (seven males and eight females)[2] in the 1978 group and 13 subjects (five males and

eight females) in the 1980 group indicated they saved money.

Table 29
What Money Was Saved For
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Trip	3	4	7	1	3	4
Articles for Personal Use	2	-	2	3	1	4
Clothes	1	3	4	-	2	2
Nothing in Particular	-	1	1	1	1	2
Other*	1	-	1	-	1	1
Total	8	7	15	5	8	13

*This category includes presents and moving to an apartment.

Table 29 shows what the subjects saved their money for. The largest number of subjects, seven (three males and four females) in the 1978 group and four (one male and three females) in the 1980 group were saving for a trip or vacation. Two (out of seven) subjects in the 1978 group and three (out of four) subjects in the 1980 group saving for a trip specifically indicated they wanted to go to Disneyland. Other subjects saved for articles for personal use, nothing in particular, presents, and moving to an apartment. One 1978 male, one 1980 male, and

[2]The change in the number of males and females in the 1978 group was because one 1978 male was not saving money and one 1978 female who did not have a bank account was looking after her own money.

one 1980 female who had bank accounts were not saving money.

The subjects who did not have bank accounts were asked, "Who takes care of your money?" The largest number of subjects, six (four males and two females) in the 1978 group and five (two males and three females) in the 1980 group had their parents take care of their money. In some of these cases bank accounts were held in trust for the subjects. The reasons for this were, as already explained, because subjects could not handle money or regulations on the amount of money that could be saved. The two subjects who lived in group homes (one 1978 male and one 1980 male) had their money taken care of by group home staff members and/or MR associations. And as indicated previously (see Footnote 2), there was one female who did not have a bank account but took care of her own money.

3) Rent, Groceries, and Clothes

The ability to handle money was further explored by a series of questions to find out whether the subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups paid for their rent, groceries, and clothes. Table 30 and Table 31 summarize this data.

Table 30
Expenses Paid For, 1978

	Rent		Groceries		Clothes	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Self-No Supervision	5	2	4	2	4	6
Self Supervision	1	-	1	-	3	1
Parents	3	6	5	6	5	3
Staff and/or Association/Group Home	3	2	3	2	1	-
Total	12	10	13	10	13	10

Table 31
Expenses Paid For, 1980

	Rent		Groceries		Clothes	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Self-No Supervision	4	4	4	4	3	6
Self Supervision	1	1	1	1	3	2
Parents	3	2	3	4	2	3
Staff and/or Association/Group Home	1	1	1	1	1	-
Total	9	8	9	10	9	11

The data in Tables 30 and 31 show that under the category of rent, the largest number of subjects 14 (out of 22) in the 1978 group had their rent paid by their parents or group home staff, while the subjects in the 1980 group were almost evenly divided between those who paid rent by themselves (eight) and those whose rent was paid by parents and group home staff

(seven). Again, under the category of groceries, the largest number of subjects, 16 (out of 23) in the 1978 group had their groceries paid for by their parents and group home staff, while the subjects in the 1980 group were again almost evenly divided between those who paid for groceries by themselves (eight) and those whose groceries were paid for by parents or group home staff (nine).

Under the category of clothes the subjects in the 1978 group were more evenly divided between clothes paid for by parents or group home staff (nine) and clothes paid for by themselves (ten). More subjects in the 1980 group (nine) paid for their clothes than did parents and group home staff (six).

A summary of the data in this sub-section shows that the 1978 subjects, whether they live with their parents or not, are more dependent on others to pay for their rent and groceries. It should be noted that in these situations the parents did not use their own money, but the money that their children received from the government and their salary from the workshops. About half the subjects who lived at home contributed to these expenses in the form of a room and board payment each month.

With reference to buying clothes, it was not always clear if the subject who paid for the clothes was the one who chose them. The major issue was that subjects in both groups were better able to pay for their clothes than for groceries and rent. The difference may be due to the fact that groceries and rent are paid on a more regular basis and as such need to be

looked after from a large, centralized sum of money. Clothes, on the other hand, are not bought on the same regular basis, so the subjects could take a sum of money whenever they wanted to go shopping. It is also of interest to note that more females than males in both groups paid for their clothes. This may suggest greater skill or perhaps more interest in clothes.

4) Spending Money

Finding out whether the subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups had spending money for the week, who decided how much they could have, and what they did with that money were all indications of the subjects' self-sufficiency.

Table 32
Control of Spending Money
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Self - No Supervision	2	4	6	5	7	12
Self-Supervision	1	-	1	-	-	-
Parents	4	3	7	2	4	6
Staff and/or Association Group Home	2	2	4	1	-	1
Total	9	9	18	8	11	19

Table 32 shows the number of subjects in each group that had spending money and who decided how much they could have.

Eighteen subjects (nine males and nine females) in the 1978 group had spending money. Of this group the parents and group home staff of 11 subjects decided how much they could have. Another six subjects decided how much money they could have themselves.

Nineteen subjects (eight males and eleven females) in the 1980 group had spending money. Of this group 12 subjects (five males and seven females) decided how much money they could have themselves. Parents and group home staff of another seven subjects decided how much money they could have.

The results in this sub-section were consistent with the results on paying for rent, groceries and clothes. The subjects in the 1978 group were more dependent on others to handle money than the subjects in the 1980 group.

The subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups spent their money on a wide variety of things. The four major categories in terms of number of subjects spending money were as follows:

i) Active Recreation

Fourteen subjects (nine males and five females) in the 1978 group and eight subjects (four males and four females) in the 1980 group spent their money on bowling, swimming, skating, and exercise classes.

ii) Food

Six subjects (three males and three females) in the 1978 group and six subjects (two males and four females) in the 1980

group spent their money on candy, coke, chips, coffee, submarine sandwiches, and yogurt.

iii) Articles for Personal Use

Five subjects (one male and four females) in the 1978 group and six subjects (three males and three females) in the 1980 group spent their money on a hockey puck, stamp album, pipe tobacco, cassette tapes, and a doodle poster.

iv) Restaurant

Four subjects (three males and one female) in the 1978 group and six subjects (two males and four females) in the 1980 group spent their money eating at MacDonald's, White Spot, and Wendy's.

v) Other Categories

A much smaller number of subjects in each of the groups also spent money on clothes, transportation, health and beauty, gifts, books and magazines, and movies/theatre/sports events.

Five subjects (four males and one female) in the 1978 group and one subject (a male) in the 1980 group did not have any spending money. The reasons given were: cannot handle money, spent money during Christmas, and not allowed to have money.

The data show that there was not much difference between what the subjects in each group used their spending money for. The most important difference was in the amount of control they had over that money.

A summary of the findings on self-sufficiency shows that in terms of meal preparation the majority of subjects in both

groups made a basic meal using pots/pans and a stove on a daily basis. The ability of the subjects living with their parents was the same as the subjects not living with their parents. The data show that the females in the 1980 group were the most skillful at cooking. A little more than 75% of all the subjects were also involved with helping in the preparation of meals.

In terms of home management tasks, 95% of the subjects in each group did jobs around the house. The subjects made their beds; washed and dried dishes; vacuumed and swept floors/rugs, dusted furniture; took out the garbage; and washed their clothes. Males and females in both groups were able to handle home management tasks equally.

The income for 83% of the subjects was from two sources, government and work. The data show that the subjects in both groups were not as self-sufficient in the handling of their money as they were in preparing meals or carrying out home management tasks. Although 65% of the subjects in both groups had bank accounts, very few subjects had real control over their money. One subject (a female) in the 1978 group, and five subjects (two males and three females) in the 1980 group had their own bank accounts; paid for their own rent, food and clothes; and decided themselves how much spending money they could have. As described above, more subjects in the 1980 group were able to handle their money and of this group was done by more females tnan males.

Being a self-sufficient person is also being able to get

around one's community as independently as possible. By combining the data on mobility independence and self-sufficiency a much larger picture began to emerge. The information from the picture shows that subjects who are self-sufficient in their homes tend to be self-sufficient out of their homes.

Interaction Level

The data presented thus far have given an indication of the ability of the former students in the 1978 and 1980 groups to travel in their communities and look after themselves. Ideally these students will also be participating in a wide variety of recreational and social activities in their communities with their friends and/or family.

The data presented in this section provide information about how the subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups interacted socially inside and outside their homes in terms of their participation in recreational and social activities and the frequency of that participation, who they participated with, their living arrangements, and the frequency and kinds of interactions with various types of people.

a) Participation in Recreational and Social Activities and Frequency of Participation

There was only one subject, a 1978 male, who did not participate in recreational or social activities outside of his

home. All other subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups participated in a large number of recreational and social activities in the community. Table 33 shows the six categories of activities that the majority of the subjects in both groups participated in.

Table 33
Activities Participated In

Activity	Number of Subjects 1978 Male	1978 Female	1980 Male	1980 Female	Number of Times	Who With 1978	1979
Shopping	5	5	5	9	1 to 5 times/ week	6/10 Staff & Mother/ Father ---- 3/14 Alone	7/14 Mother/ Father
Bowling	7	3	4	6	1 time/ week	5/10 Workshop	8/10 Workshop
Visiting	7	5	3	4	1 to 2 times/ week	5/12 Alone ---- 5/12 Family	4/7 Mother/ Father
Eating in a Restaurant	6	3	2	6	1 to 5 times/ week	4/10 Friends	4/8 Parents & Family
Other	5	4	3	3	1 to 4 times/ week	3/9 Alone 3/9 Workshop	3/6 Alone
Church	4	4	3	3	1 to 2 times/ week	4/8 Family	3/6 Mother/ Father

1) Shopping

This activity was done by the largest number of subjects in the study, ten (five males and five females) in the 1978 group and 14 (five males and nine females) in the 1980 group. Most subjects went shopping once a week with group home staff members or their mothers/fathers. One subject in the 1978 group (a female) went shopping every day, but this was rather exceptional. It should be noted that part of the interviews were conducted during December, 1981 and as such reflect the increased shopping activity for the Christmas season.

2) Bowling

Twenty subjects, ten from each group, participated in bowling. This activity was done once a week and was organized by workshops.

3) Visiting

Subjects either visited or were visited by relatives and/or friends once or twice a week. Subjects in the 1978 group went visiting by themselves or with various members of their families. Four (out of seven) 1980 subjects went with their mothers/fathers.

4) Eating in a Restaurant

Nine subjects (six males and three females) in the 1978 group and eight subjects (two males and six females) in the 1980 group ate in restaurants. Only one subject ate in a restaurant

more than once a week. The subjects in the 1978 group ate in restaurants with friends. The subjects in the 1980 group ate in restaurants with their parents and family.

5) Other Activities

This category was developed to keep track of those activities that did not fit into any of the other categories. The activities included here were playing bingo, doing arts and crafts, going to the library, taking a drive, going to a social club, and attending a music lesson. These activities were done one to four times a week. In the 1978 group, three subjects did these activities alone and three did these activities through their workshops. Three subjects in the 1980 group went to these types of activities alone.

6) Church

Eight subjects (four males and four females) in the 1978 group and six subjects (three males and three females) in the 1980 group went to church or attended Bible study class once or twice a week. Four subjects in the 1978 group went to church with their mothers/fathers, sisters/brothers or entire family.

The data show that the types of activities participated in by the subjects in both groups are similar to those done by non-handicapped persons. The data also show that the activities were participated in equally by males and females in both groups.

Living Arrangements

1) Subjects Living With Parents

As indicated previously in the demographic data description (see Tables 11 & 12), 13 subjects (seven males and six females) in the 1978 group and 13 subjects (five males and eight females) in the 1980 group lived with their parents.

Table 34
Reasons for Subjects Living With Their Parents
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Like living at home	1	1	2	4	6	10
Important member of the family	4	3	7	-	1	1
Dependent on parent	1	1	2	1	-	1
No appropriate group home	1	-	1	-	1	1
Medical problem	-	1	1	-	-	-
Total	7	6	13	5	8	13

Table 34 shows the reasons why subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups lived with their parents. The reasons given by most subjects, seven (four males and three females), in the 1978 group, was they were important members of their families. While ten subjects (four males and six females) in the 1980 group reported they liked living at home. Less often cited reasons were dependent on parents, no appropriate group home available, and a medical problem.

One of the concerns under the category of interaction level was the frequency and kinds of interaction the subjects had with their parents. The data show that all of the subjects, in both groups, who lived with their parents spent time with them. In their homes subjects ate meals, watched television, played parlour games, did crafts, worked in the backyard, played music, and put up a Christmas tree. Outside of their homes subjects went shopping, visited friends and relatives, ate in restaurants and went to church.

Table 35
Type of Help Needed For Subjects Living With Parents
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Reasonable assistance	2	2	4	1	4	5
Grooming	3	1	4	2	3	5
Medication/diet	-	2	2	-	-	-
Total	5	5	10	3	7	10

Table 35 shows the type of help that was needed by the subjects in the 1978 and 1980 group who lived with their parents. Four subjects (two males and two females) in the 1978 group and five subjects (one male and four females) in the 1980 group needed reasonable assistance, e.g. help to use the vacuum cleaner, knit, take down a Christmas tree, and clean a fish tank. Four subjects (three males and one female) in the 1978 group and five subjects (two males and three females) in the 1980 group needed help with grooming, e.g., brush and/or wash

hair, help brush teeth, and tie shoes. And finally, two subjects (both females) in the 1978 group needed help with their medication and diet, e.g. put in eye drops and control what a subject ate. Not shown in Table 35 was that three subjects (two males and one female) in each group indicated they did not need any help from their parents.

The subjects who lived with their parents were asked if they wanted to change with whom or where they were living. The data show that three subjects (two males and one female) in the 1978 group and one subject (a female) in the 1980 group wanted to live somewhere else. The two 1978 males wanted to move to group homes, the 1978 female wanted to live on her own, and the 1980 female wanted to live with friends.

The data in this sub-section portray two groups of adults who were active and well integrated members of their families. The data from Table 35 show that a relatively small number of subjects, four in 1978 and five in 1980 were with their parents because they were quite dependent. The subjects in both groups were also quite happy to be with their parents as indicated by the fact that only three subjects in the 1978 group and one in the 1980 group wanted to live somewhere else. It was of interest to see that there were no differences between males and females as well as no differences over time. This suggests that the lives of the subjects in both groups were stable and very comfortable.

2) Subjects Not Living with Their Parents

The demographic description in Chapter 1 also showed that ten subjects (six males and four females) in the 1978 group and seven subjects (four males and three females) in the 1980 group did not live with their parents.

Table 36
Reasons for Not Living With Parents
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Difficulty in family	3	3	6	1	1	2
Wants to live more independently	1	1	2	1	1	2
Has not lived with family for a while	1	-	1	2	-	2
No facilities	-	-	-	-	1	1
Total	5	4	9	4	3	7

Only one subject (a 1978 male) was not living with his parents because they had died. The rest of the subjects in both groups had at least one parent living. Table 36 shows the reasons why these subjects in both groups were not living with their parents. Six subjects (three males and three females) in the 1978 group and two subjects (one male and one female) in the 1980 group were not living with their parents because there were difficulties in their families, i.e., not getting along. Another two subjects in each group wanted to live more independently. Other subjects, one in 1978 and two in 1980, had not lived with their parents for a while. And one 1980 female

had to live away from her parent because there were no opportunities to work where they lived.

There was interest in the kinds of interactions these subjects had with their parents. The data on these are summarized in Table 37.

Table 37
Interactions of Subjects and Parents
For Subjects Not Living With Parents
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Visit	1	1	2	-	-	-
Telephone	2	1	3	1	1	2
Visit & telephone	1	2	3	1	1	2
No contact	1	-	1	2	1	3
Total	5	4	9	4	3	7

The interactions between subjects and their parents were either visiting or speaking on the phone and for three subjects in the 1978 group and two subjects in the 1980 group both activities were done. Subjects who visited their parents participated in family activities like eating meals together, watching TV, eating in a restaurant, or shopping. In one case a subject's mother visited her and in one case there were reciprocal visits between subject and mother. There were subjects in both groups, one (a male) in 1978 and three (two males and one female) in 1980, who had no contact with their parents. The reasons for this were parents lived too far away, parents/subject were/was

busy, a parent was sick, and parents and subject only saw one another at certain times of the year, e.g., Christmas, Easter, Thanksgiving.

The subjects and parents who interacted on the telephone did so once a week most often (three subjects in each group). Two subjects in the 1978 group spoke to their parents every day and one subject in the 1980 group spoke twice a week. The reasons for not phoning were the same as those mentioned above for not visiting.

A summary of these data indicates that the subjects and parents who interacted tended to do so on a regular basis. And as might be expected those subjects who were not with their parents for positive reasons like wanting to live more independently had more contact with them than those who were not with their parents for negative reasons like not getting along.

Table 38
Type and Source of Help For Subjects Not Living With Parents
Gender by Year

	1978						1980					
	Staff		Brothers		Staff & Res./ Friends		Staff		Res./ Friends		Staff & Res./ Friends	
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Reasonable assistance	2	3	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	1	1	-
Grooming	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Total	3	4	1	-	1	-	2	-	1	1	1	-

Table 38 shows the type and source of help for subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups who did not live with their parents. Seven (out of seven) subjects in the 1978 group and four (out of five) subjects in the 1980 group needed reasonable assistance, which as previously explained, was help doing daily chores and activities around the house. Only one subject (a male) in the 1980 group needed help with grooming. The source of help 50% of the time was group home staff members. The other 50% was provided by brothers, residents/friends, and staff and residents/friends. Not shown in Table 38 was that two subjects (both males) in the 1978 group and two subjects (one male and one female) in the 1980 group did not need help. Also not shown was a 1978 subject (a female) who wanted help to do things around the house but was not getting any from the people she lived with.

The subjects who did not live with their parents were also asked if they wanted to change with whom or where they were

living. The data show that these subjects (two males and one female) in the 1978 group and one subject (a male) in the 1980 group wanted to live somewhere else. The three subjects in the 1978 group wanted to move to smaller group-type living arrangements with less supervision. The 1980 male wanted to live with friends.

The data in this sub-section portray two groups of adults who were not, for a variety of reasons, living with their parents. However, 75% of these subjects interacted with their parents on a regular basis by visiting or speaking on the telephone and sometimes both. In terms of the help needed the subjects not living with their parents were not as dependent on the others they lived with. This was in contrast to the four subjects in the 1978 group and five subjects in the 1980 group who were dependent on their parents for help in basic grooming skills. The subjects in both groups not living with their parents were happy to live where they were.

3) Interactions With Other Relatives

Table 39
Interactions of Subjects With Other Relatives
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Visit	4	5	9	1	1	2
Telephone	-	-	-	3	1	4
Visit & telephone	2	5	7	3	4	7
No contact	7	-	7	2	5	7
Total	13	10	23	9	11	20

Table 39 shows the interactions between subjects, in both groups, and relatives other than their parents. The relatives most often seen or spoken to by the subjects in both groups, 12 in 1978 and eight in 1980, were their brothers and sisters. Other relatives like aunts and uncles, grandparents, cousins, and nieces and nephews were seen or spoken to by two or three subjects in each group once or twice a week. Because there were so few other relatives seen or spoken, to the data in Table 39 were collapsed from five categories into one for each gender in each group.

The subjects who visited their relatives participated in activities like eating meals together, talking, eating in restaurants, shopping, or going to movies. In the case of brothers and sisters, they usually saw the subjects when they saw their parents. Nearly a third of the subjects in the two groups did not have any contact with their relatives. The reasons for this were relatives lived too far away, weather was bad, relatives were busy, no relatives in Canada, and no contact

with relatives.

A summary of the data indicates that the subjects in both groups did have some contact with other relatives. In no case was the interaction so significant that it made a difference to what the subjects in both groups did or did not do.

4) Girl/Boy Friends

The topic of having a girl or boy friend is a rather sensitive one for both handicapped and non-handicapped persons. The issue is sensitive because how a person perceives another person as a girl or boy friend is very subjective. The question used in this study to elicit this information was qualified to find out if the subject knew a person special to them that they liked and that special person was perceived to like the subject in the same way.

Table 40
Subjects Having Boy/Girl Friends and Where They Met
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Workshop	4	1	5	2	1	3
School	1	-	1	1	2	3
School & workshop	-	1	1	1	1	2
Recreation/social	-	1	1	-	1	1
Work & recreation/social	-	1	1	-	-	-
Total	5	4	9	4	5	9

Table 40 shows the number of subjects in each group that

had girl/boy friends and where they met. The largest number of subjects, five (four males and one female) in the 1978 group and three (two males and one female) in the 1980 group, met their girl/boy friends at the workshop where they were employed. Other subjects met their girl/boy friends at school, workshop and school, recreation/social activities, or work and recreation/social activities.

All but one of the places/activities mentioned above were organized for mentally handicapped adults. One subject (a 1978 female) met her boyfriend at a recreation/social activity organized for non-handicapped persons.

The data show that the majority of subjects who had girl/boy friends saw them between one and five times a week. Two subjects in the 1978 group saw their girl/boy friends every day.

The subjects in both groups saw their girl/boy friends at work and at recreation/social activities or a combination of both. A girl/boy friend who worked in the same workshop also went bowling or went to a dance once a week. These data are consistent with and support what was reported on participation in recreation/social activities in the section on interaction level. They also support what was reported on what spending money was used for in the section on self-sufficiency, and what was reported on the use of transportation in the section on mobility independence.

Four subjects (two males and two females) in the 1978 group and five subjects (three males and two females) in the 1980 group spoke to their girl/boy friends on the telephone about three times a week.

A summary of the data in this sub-section show that the relationships these mentally handicapped adults had were with other mentally handicapped adults. The interactions these adults have tended to be at work and recreation/social activities organized by workshops and associations or a combination of both. About half of the subjects in each group communicated with their girl/boy friends on the telephone. The data suggest that the adults function better socially in a structured environment.

5) Other Friendships

Table 41
Subjects Having Good Friends and Where They Met
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
School	3	-	3	2	1	3
Workshop	-	3	3	-	3	3
Group home	-	-	-	1	-	1
School & workshop	3	5	8	3	5	8
School & group home	-	-	-	1	-	1
Workshop & group home	3	1	4	1	1	2
School & workshop & group home	1	-	1	1	-	1
Farm	1	1	2	-	1	1
Total	11	10	21	9	11	20

Table 41 shows the number of subjects in each group that had friends and where they met. The largest number of subjects, eight (three males and five females) in both groups, met their friends at the school they graduated from and the workshop they were employed in. Other subjects met their friends just at school, workshop, and group home or various combinations of these places. All but two 1978 subjects (both males) had friends that they did things with.

The subjects who lived in the same group homes saw each other every day. The subjects who worked in the same workshop saw each other five days a week. And if they participated in the same recreation/social activities they usually saw each other six days a week.

Five subjects (one male and four females) in the 1978 group

and six subjects (one male and five females) in the 1980 group spoke to their friends on the telephone about twice a week.

The data also show that three subjects (one male and two females) in the 1978 group and one subject (a female) in the 1980 group had friends who they knew away from school and workshop. These friends were seen once or twice a week. The subjects visited, went swimming, shopping, and ate in a restaurant with their non-handicapped friends. They also spoke to these friends once or twice a week.

A summary of the data in this sub-section were the same as the results in the previous sub-section in terms of who the subjects interact with and the kinds of activities they participated in. A few subjects also had friendships with non-handicapped people. Most important of all was the fact that subjects in both groups were busy in a wide variety of activities in their communities.

A summary of the findings on interaction level shows that the subjects, in both groups were participants in all types of activities in their communities. Who they participated with in these activities reflected where they lived and/or worked with as well as their ability to travel independently in the community.

The subjects, in both groups, who lived with their parents were important participants in the families' activities. Those who lived with their parents were quite content to stay with

them. The subjects who did not live with their parents were also content to stay where they lived. The only difference found between the subjects in the two living arrangements was in the kind of help they needed. Nine subjects who lived with their parents needed help in basic skills like grooming, while only one subject who lived in a group home needed the same kind of help.

Interactions with relatives outside their immediate families was somewhat limited, especially those who did not live with their parents. The relatives most frequently seen were their older brothers and sisters.

Girl/boy friends or any other friendships were with other mentally handicapped adults. The subjects and their friends often worked in the same workshops or lived in the same group homes. Interactions between friends were almost exclusively limited to activities organized by workshops and associations.

The data in this section helped to give a better understanding of mobility independence by focusing more on the types of activities done and who the subjects did the activities with. It was suggested that one of the reasons the subjects in the 1980 group were being driven in cars so much was that the subjects were participating in activities with their families or other residents of group homes. The data in this section substantiate the explanation presented above for participation with families.

The data presented in the section on self-sufficiency showed that there was not a great deal of difference in the abilities of the subjects who lived with and did not live with their parents. In the data on interaction level it was found that nine subjects who lived with their parents needed help in basic skills like grooming while only one subject who lived in a group home needed the same kind of help. The findings here seem somewhat incongruous with the findings in self-sufficiency. A possible explanation of this may be that parents with children who have difficulty with basic skills tend to want to keep them under close supervision at home. Or perhaps skills like grooming should have been included in the data on self-sufficiency. The relatively small numbers of subjects in this study make it especially difficult to attempt any definitive answer.

Vocational Ability

There is now a picture of the former students' community adjustment in terms of their mobility independence, self-sufficiency, and interaction level. These are all important components of community adjustment, but there is another component that is probably the most important. The component is one of the most important expectations society has after a person graduates from school. The expectation is that of obtaining a job and becoming a productive, useful, and independent member of society. The expectation is also held for mentally handicapped adults within the limits of their

capabilities.

The data presented in this section are used to describe the vocational ability of the subjects in the 1978 and 1980 groups in terms of their employment status and occupational status. The characteristics of their employment status are summarized in Table 42 for 1978 and Table 43 for 1980.

Table 42
Present Vocational Ability of Students, 1978

Characteristics	Gender			
	Male		Female	
Employment Status	N	%	N	%
a) Present Employment				
Subjects	13	100.0	9	90.0
Full time	11	84.6	9	100.0
Part-time	2	15.4	-	-
b) Length of Time				
Less than 1 year	1	7.7	1	11.1
1-3 years	11	84.6	8	88.9
More than 3 years	1	7.7	-	-
c) Places of Employment				
Workshop	10	79.9	7	77.8
Factory	1	7.7	1	11.1
Restaurant	1	7.7	-	-
Farm	1	7.7	1	11.1
d) Type of Employment				
Competitive	2	15.4	-	-
Sheltered	11	84.6	9	100.0
e) Occupational Status				
Skill level 1	3	23.1	3	33.3
Skill level 2	8	61.5	4	44.4
Skill level 3	2	15.4	2	22.2

Table 43
Present Vocational Ability of Students, 1980

Characteristics	Gender			
	Male		Female	
Employment Status	N	%	N	%
a) Present Employment				
Subjects	8	88.9	10	90.9
Full time	7	87.5	10	100.0
Part-time	1	12.5	-	-
b) Length of Time				
Less than 1 year	2	25.0	-	-
1-2 years	6	75.0	10	100.0
More than 2 years	-	-	-	-
c) Places of Employment				
Workshop	6	75.0	9	90.0
Restaurant	2	25.0	-	-
Farm	-	-	1	10.0
d) Type of Employment				
Competitive	2	25.0	-	-
Sheltered	6	75.0	10	100.0
e) Occupational Status				
Skill level 1	4	50.0	-	-
Skill level 2	2	25.0	8	80.0
Skill level 3	2	25.0	2	20.0

a) Present Employment

Thirteen 1978 males (100%) were working and nine 1978 females (90%) were working. Of those 1978 subjects employed, 11 males and all the females were working full time. Two males were working part-time.

Eight males (88.9%) and ten females (90.9%) in the 1980 group were working. Seven 1980 males and all of the females

were working full time. One 1980 male was working part-time.

From the large number of subjects in both groups employed, it would seem that there were appropriate jobs for these people to go to once they left school. And there were no differences between groups or between males and females.

b) Length of Time

Eleven males (84.6%) and eight females (88.9%) in the 1978 group worked at their present jobs between one and three years. One 1978 male and female worked for less than a year; while one 1978 male worked at a job for more than three years. Although not shown in Table 42, the mean length of time at a job for the 1978 group was 2.7 years.

Six males (75%) and ten females (100%) in the 1980 group worked at their present jobs between one and two years. Two 1980 males worked at their jobs for less than a year. And although not shown in Table 43, the 1980 group's mean length of time of work was 1.2 years The mean of 1.2 years reflected the fact that seven 1980 subjects reported working for 1.5 years and one 1980 male reported working two years at the time of the interviews.

The amount of time at their jobs reflects the stability of the subjects. the majority of subjects were employed since they graduated from school.

c) Places of Employment

Most of the 1978 subjects, ten males and seven females, worked in workshops. One male and one female worked in factories, one male worked at a restaurant, while one male and female worked on a farm.

Like the 1978 subjects, most of the 1980 subjects (six males and nine females) worked in workshops. Two males worked in restaurants and one female worked on a farm.

d) Type of Employment

Two 1978 males (15.4%) and no females worked in competitive employment. Eleven 1978 males (84.6%) and all of the females worked in sheltered employment.

In the 1980 group two males (25%) and no females worked in competitive employment. Six 1980 males (75%) and all of the females worked in sheltered employment.

The data in this sub-section present an important issue, why there are no females in competitive employment. No definitive answers may be given, but one of the most important may be skill. Another important explanation may be societal expectations; males are expected to be able to do more demanding work. Work in a competitive environment is seen as too hard physically for females.

e) Occupational Status

As mentioned previously, in Chapter 4, the coding of the data on occupational status (highest skill level ever obtained in any job) was done using the Vocational Check List of the Adaptive Functioning Index (Marlett, 1973). And as shown in Appendix F, the job description of each subject was related to one of the five skill levels defined in the Vocational Check List.

The largest number of 1978 subjects, eight males (61.5%) and four females (44.4%) worked at Skill Level 2. this was followed by three males (23.1%) and three females (33.3%) at Skill Level 1; and two males (15.4%) and two females (22.2%) at Skill Level 3.

The largest number of subjects in the 1980 group also worked at Skill Level 2, two males (25%) and eight females (80%). Four 1980 males (50%) and no females worked at Skill Level 1. Two 1980 males (25%) and two females (20%) worked at Skill Level 3.

Overall, the data in this section show that there were no differences in terms of skill level between males and females and no differences between groups. This would suggest that the types of jobs in all workshops are quite similar and the training the males and females received was quite similar as well.

A more complete picture of place, type, and skill level

(occupational status) of employment is presented in Table 44 for 1978 and Table 45 for 1980.

Table 44
Type, Place and Skill Level of Present Employment, 1978

		Competitive			Sheltered	
		Factory	Restaurant	Workshop	Factory	Farm
Skill Level 1	Male	-	-	3	-	-
	Female	-	-	2	1	-
Skill Level 2	Male	1	1	6	-	-
	Female	-	-	4	-	-
Skill Level 3	Male	-	-	1	-	1
	Female	-	-	1	-	1
Total		1	1	17	1	2

Table 44 highlights some of the most important aspects of the vocational ability of the 1980 subjects. Twenty (out of 22) subjects who worked were in sheltered employment. Seventeen (out of 19) subjects in sheltered employment worked in workshops. Twelve (out of 22) subjects worked at Skill Level 2. This included the two males working in competitive employment.

Table 45
Type, Place and Skill Level of Present Employment, 1980

		Competitive	Sheltered	
		Restaurant	Workshop	Farm
Skill Level 1	Male	-	4	-
	Female	-	-	-
Skill Level 2	Male	-	1	-
	Female	-	8	-
Skill Level 3	Male	2	1	-
	Female	-	1	1
Total		2	15	1

Table 45 does the same thing for the 1980 subjects. Sixteen (out of 18) subjects who worked were in sheltered employment. Fifteen (out of 16) subjects in sheltered employment worked in workshops. Nine (out of 18) subjects worked at Skill Level 2. Five (out of 18) subjects worked at Skill Level 3; this included the two males working in competitive employment.

The characteristics of the subjects' previous employment are summarized in Table 46 for 1978 and Table 47 for 1980.

Table 46
Previous Vocational Ability of Students, 1978

Characteristics	Gender			
	Male		Female	
Employment Status	N	%	N	%
a) Present Employment				
Subjects	3	23.1	1	10.0
Full time	2	66.7	1	100.0
Part-time	1	33.3	-	-
b) Length of Time				
Less than 1 year	-	-	-	-
1-3 years	3	10.0	1	100.0
More than 3 years	-	-	-	-
c) Places of Employment				
Workshop	2	66.7	1	100.0
Store	1	33.3	-	-
d) Type of Employment				
Competitive	1	33.3	-	-
Sheltered	2	66.7	1	100.0
e) Occupational Status				
Skill level 1	1	33.3	-	-
Skill level 2	1	33.3	1	100.0
Skill level 3	1	33.3	-	-

Table 47
Previous Vocational Ability of Students, 1980

Characteristics	Gender			
	Male		Female	
Employment Status	N	%	N	%
a) Present Employment				
Subjects	2	22.2	2	18.2
Full time	2	100.0	2	100.0
Part-time	-	-	-	-
b) Length of Time				
Less than 1 year	1	50.0	2	100.0
1-2 years	1	50.0	-	-
More than 2 years	-	-	-	-
c) Places of Employment				
Workshop	2	100.0	2	100.0
d) Type of Employment				
Competitive	-	-	-	-
Sheltered	2	100.0	2	100.0
e) Occupational Status				
Skill level 1	1	50.0	2	100.0
Skill level 2	-	-	-	-
Skill level 3	1	50.0	-	-

a) Previous Employment

Three 1978 males (23.1%) and one 1978 female (10%) were previously employed. Two males (66.7%) and the one female were employed full time. One male (33.3%) was employed full time.

Two 1980 males (22.2%) and two 1980 females (18.2%) were previously employed. All the males and females previously employed worked full time.

b) Length of Time

The three 1978 males and the 1978 female worked between one and three years.

One 1980 male worked less than a year as did the two 1980 females. The other 1980 male worked between one and two years.

c) Places of Employment

Three (out of the four) 1980 subjects previously employed worked in workshops. One 1978 male worked in a store.

All four subjects in the 1980 group worked in workshops.

d) Type of Employment

One male and the one female in the 1978 group worked in sheltered environments. The other 1978 male worked in a competitive environment.

All four subjects in the 1980 group worked in sheltered environments.

e) Occupational Status

One of the three 1978 males worked at Skill Level 1, another worked at Skill Level 2, and the last worked at Skill Level 3. The 1978 female worked at Skill Level 2.

One 1980 male worked at Skill Level 1 and another 1980 male worked at Skill Level 3. The two 1980 females worked at Skill Level 3.

Table 48
Type, Place and Skill Level of Previous Employment
Gender by Year

		1978 Competitive	1978 Sheltered	1980 Sheltered
		Store	Workshop	Workshop
Skill Level 1	Male	-	1	1
	Female	-	-	2
Skill Level 2	Male	-	1	-
	Female	-	1	-
Skill Level 3	Male	1	-	1
	Female	-	-	-
Total		1	3	4

Table 48 shows some of the highlights of the previous employment of the 1978 and 1980 subjects. Three (out of four) 1978 subjects who worked were in sheltered employment. Three (out of three) 1978 subjects in sheltered employment worked in workshops. Two (out of three) subjects in workshops worked at Skill Level 2. The 1978 male who was working in competitive employment worked at Skill Level 3.

All four of the 1980 subjects who worked previously were in sheltered employment. All four of the 1980 subjects in sheltered employment worked in workshops. Three (out of four) 1980 subjects worked at Skill Level 1. One 1980 male worked at Skill Level 3.

A review of the findings shows that occupational status did not change very much from previous to present jobs. For a 1978

male and female there was a change from level 3 to level 2, and level 2 to level 1, respectively. One 1978 male was at level 1 in both jobs.

Two 1980 males stayed at the same levels in both jobs, level 1 and level 3 respectively. Two 1980 females went from level 1 at their previous jobs to level 2 at the present jobs. Any change for either group may be attributed to a change in the type of work done by the subject.

The data showed that three male subjects worked part-time. The two 1978 males in competitive employment worked two or three days a week. The 1980 male worked part-time in both competitive and sheltered employment.

There were three subjects that were not working; one 1978 female, one 1980 male and one 1980 female. The 1978 female had worked at two jobs in sheltered employment at Skill Levels 1 and 2. The 1978 male was not working because he was enrolled in an adult educational programme on a full time basis. The 1980 female had worked for three months in a factory at Skill Level 3. The subject was at home helping her mother at the time of the interview.

A summary of the findings in this section show that a large number of subjects, 22 in 1978 and ten in 1980 were employed. Seventeen subjects in the 1978 group and 15 subjects in the 1980 group were working in sheltered workshops. Two males in each group worked in competitive employment. More than half the

subjects, 12 in 1978 and ten in 1980, worked at Skill Level 2. In terms of the length of employment, the subjects showed a great deal of stability. The subjects in the 1978 group worked for a mean of 2.7 years, while the subjects in the 1980 group worked for a mean of 1.2 years.

Work for non-handicapped persons in society is an important part of their lives. Work for mentally handicapped persons is perhaps the most important part of their adjustment to living in the community. Indeed, their recreational ability as well as their presence in the work environment are closely related to the three other aspects of their community adjustment discussed so far.

In relation to mobility independence, going to work reflected the subjects' ability to travel independently in the community. Subjects who used the B.C. Hydro bus to go to work were more likely to have greater mobility than those subjects driven to work on an Easter Seal or HandiDart bus. The B.C. Hydro bus was not necessarily used by subjects who had the most skilled jobs; subjects who worked at Skill Level 1 jobs also took the B.C. Hydro bus to work.

Whether a subject had a few or many self-sufficiency skills he/she still had a job at a workshop. (And that job, regardless of skill level, was one of the sources of income for about 85% of the subjects in both groups.) Despite this seeming lack of correspondence between self-sufficiency and vocational ability the general tendency is for subjects with higher self-

sufficiency skills to have higher vocational skills.

In terms of interaction level, the workshop is the most important source of relationships outside the subjects' home. Not only is the workshop the basis for friendships but it is also the basis for a wide variety of social activities like bowling and parties organized by the workshops and associations.

Educational Status

There is now a picture of the former students' community adjustment in terms of their mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, and vocational ability. Even though they graduated from school it is important for the former students to improve and increase a wide variety of skills to become independent members of the community. A large number of former students have participated in an increasing number of courses sponsored by MR associations, workshops, community recreation departments, and community colleges.

The data presented in this section provide information about the type of educational programmes in which subjects were enrolled subsequent to their leaving the formal school system.

Table 49 shows that six (26.1%) 1978 subjects and six (35%) 1980 subjects were enrolled in educational programmes. The types of courses taken by the subjects in both groups are summarized in Table 50.

Table 49
Frequencies and Percentages of Subjects
Enrolled in Adult School Programmes
Gender by Year

	Male		Female		Group Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	
1978	4	30.8	2	20.0	6	26.1
1980	2	22.2	4	36.4	6	30.0
Total	6	27.3	6	28.6	12	27.9

Table 50
Type of Courses Enrolled In
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Functional	3	1	4	1	2	3
Academic	1	1	2	-	1	1
Functional & academic	-	-	-	1	1	2
Total	4	2	6	2	4	6

Four subjects (three males and one females) in the 1978 group and three subjects (one male and two females) in the 1980 group were enrolled in courses which, for the purposes of this study, were classified as functional, i.e. courses relating to the acquisition of skills such as handling money, telling time, cooking and conversing with people. Two subjects (one male and one female) in the 1978 group and one subject (a female) in the 1980 group were enrolled in academic courses related to the

acquisition of reading, writing and arithmetic skills. And one 1980 male and 1980 female took a combination of functional and academic courses.

Courses were held at a number of high schools, workshops, community centers, and community colleges. Courses were attended by the same number of subjects in both groups. It is of interest to see that there were as many subjects in the 1980 group taking courses as in in the 1978 group even though they had just graduated from school one year before. It would seem reasonable to suggest that with the variety of post school educational programmes available the recent graduates were encouraged to continue learning and expanding their skills and hence enrolled in courses when they left school.

The relatively small number of subjects in both groups who took courses reflected the fact that interviews were conducted immediately before and after Christmas. Subjects did not attend courses from the second week in December, 1981 until the third week of January, 1982.

Table 51
Type of Courses Presently Enrolled In
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Functional	2	1	3	-	-	-
Academic	-	1	1	-	1	1
Recreation/leisure	-	-	-	1	-	1
Functional & academic	-	-	-	-	2	2
Functional & recreation/leisure	1	-	1	-	-	-
Total	3	2	5	1	3	4

Table 51 shows that five subjects (three males and two females) in the 1978 group and four subjects (one male and three females) in the 1980 group who were taking courses had taken courses previously and what courses they took. The only course not previously defined is that of recreation/leisure which was classified as relating to the acquisition of skills in a variety of sports, fitness, arts and crafts, camping and fishing.

One 1978 male, one 1980 male, and one 1980 female were taking their first adult education courses. The reasons provided by these three subjects for not taking adult education courses previously were working at night, and no courses of interest available.

The subjects who indicated that they were not presently taking a course were asked if they would like to enroll in an adult education course. Thirteen (of the 17) 1978 subjects responded affirmatively; 12 (of the 14) 1980 subjects responded

likewise.

Six subjects (two 1978 males, two 1978 females, and two 1980 females) indicated that they did not want to take any courses. Reasons given for not wanting to take a course were not interested, not enough skills, and not allowed to go out at night.

The same 17 subjects in the 1978 group and 14 subjects in the 1980 group were asked if they were ever enrolled in an adult education course. Table 52 shows what courses were previously taken by the ten subjects (five males and five females) in the 1978 group and the 13 subjects (six males and seven females) in the 1980 group.

Table 52
Type of Courses Previously Enrolled In
For Subjects Not Enrolled In Courses
Gender by Year

	1978			1980		
	Male	Female	Group Total	Male	Female	Group Total
Functional	4	2	6	3	4	7
Academic	-	1	1	-	-	-
Recreation/leisure	-	-	-	1	1	2
Functional & academic	1	1	2	1	-	1
Functional & recreation/leisure	-	1	1	1	1	2
Vocational	-	-	-	-	1	1
Total	5	5	10	6	7	13

All of the courses, except one, were the same as those mentioned previously. One 1980 female took a course classified

as vocational, i.e., a course relating to the acquisition of working skills such as using equipment properly, working at an appropriate speed, and following instructions.

Of interest is the fact that a large number of 1980 subjects (12) were enrolled in adult education courses. The data here further support the importance of continuing education for the 1980 graduates.

Seven subjects (four males and three females) in the 1978 group and one subject (a male) in the 1980 group had never taken any adult education courses. The reasons given were appropriate courses not available, volunteers were needed, not enough skills, and not allowed to go out at night.

A summary of the findings on educational status shows that because of the Christmas-New Year period, a relatively small number of subjects in both groups were taking courses. This was not an accurate indication of the subjects' participation in adult education courses. If the subjects who were taking courses and the subjects who had taken courses previously were considered together for each group, the data would show that 16 subjects (69.6%) in the 1978 group and 19 subjects (95%) in the 1980 group were involved in some form of adult education programmes. As mentioned previously, the recent graduates were encouraged to continue learning and expanding their skills and hence enrolled in adult education courses. The courses taken most often were functional, academic, and a combination of functional and academic.

In terms of its relationship to the former students' community adjustment, educational status does not seem to be as important as the four previous aspects. This is because the participation of mentally handicapped adults in post school educational programmes is a relatively new concept.

Educational status is probably most closely related to vocational ability as many of the courses are offered by MR associations through their workshops. The courses offered are quite varied and related to the needs of the students. This would seem to indicate that the role of the workshop is no longer that of just keeping their clients busy but teaching them new skills. The involvement of various community facilities like community centers and community colleges is a positive indication of how mentally retarded adults are becoming more involved in the community.

Chapter 6

Summary and Conclusions

Summary of the Study

Since Fernald's first study in 1919 a large body of information has developed in the area of follow-up research. The research has looked at both "formerly institutionalized individuals and graduates of special schools or special classes in the public schools" (Rosen et al., 1977, p. 131).

The majority of follow-up research has been done in the United States. There has also been a small amount of this research in Canada. Two follow-up studies have been reported, Lambert (1976) who looked at the community adjustment of mentally retarded adults living in the province of Ontario and Lusthaus et al., (1979) who looked at the community adjustment of a group of mentally retarded adults living in Montreal. No research of this type has been done in the province of British Columbia.

The present research project was designed to describe the current status of moderately retarded adults living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, one and three years after they have graduated from school, in terms of their mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status.

Based on the research conducted by Lambert (1976) an interview-prompt recording sheet was first pilot tested and then used to gather data on the community adjustment of an accessible sample of moderately retarded adults in the Lower Mainland area of British Columbia. Twenty-three adults (13 males and ten females) who graduated from school in 1978 and 20 adults (nine males and 11 females) who graduated from school in 1980 were interviewed.

The data were analyzed by comparing the frequency distribution for males and females from each of 1978 and 1980 by using the 2x2 (year-by-gender) chi-square statistic. The results of the chi-square analysis revealed that for each component of community adjustment the distribution for males and females within and between 1978 and 1980 were not significantly different ($p<.05$). The results were reported in a descriptive manner and in terms of the cell and marginal frequencies and percentage for gender and year.

Conclusions of the Study

While describing the current status of mentally retarded adults in terms of each of the five variables, the following conclusions were made.

Mobility Independence

Males and females, in the 1978 and 1980 groups, were able

to travel in their communities quite extensively. Five subjects (21.7%) in the 1978 group and one subject (5%) in the 1980 group used only the public transportation system. Another nine subjects in each group (39.1% in 1978 and 45% in 1980) took the bus and rode in cars with their parents, friends, or group home staff. And finally, nine subjects (39.1%) in the 1978 group and ten subjects (50%) in the 1980 group rode only on supervised forms of transport (Easter Seal bus, family car, group home van).

In terms of the previous research, the findings in this study show that the subjects in both groups have a high rate of mobility independence.

Saenger (1957), in his study of mentally handicapped adults in New York City, found that 20% of the subjects were not allowed to leave their homes without being accompanied by a significant other, while another 14% could take a bus or subway in a familiar area and 21% could take a bus or subway anywhere. The findings in Saenger's study suggest that his subjects were more dependent or more overprotected than the subjects in the present study.

Stanfield (1973) found subjects who were far less mobile. Stanfield reported that 40% of the subjects could not leave their homes unescorted. Another 60% of the subjects were mobile within their own neighbourhood but only 10% left the immediate neighbourhood to travel in the larger community. The findings in Stanfield's study suggest that the subjects were not mobile

because of ability, lack of training to use the public transportation system, and overprotection of parents. It is also important to consider that Stanfield's study was conducted in the Los Angeles area, where it is difficult to get around without having a car or knowing someone who does.

Lambert (1976) found that 78.3% of the subjects were dependent on someone to get them to work and another 56.6% did not use public transportation to travel in the community. The low mobility independence of Lambert's subjects would again suggest that the ability of the subjects, lack of training to use the public transportation system, and overprotection of parents gave rise to lesser mobility.

The data in this study show that the overall mobility of the subjects in both groups is high.

Self-Sufficiency

There were three aspects of interest in considering self-sufficiency. In the first aspect, meal preparation, 18 subjects (78.3%) in the 1978 group and 18 subjects (90%) in the 1980 group made a basic meal using pots/pans and a stove on a daily basis. A little more than 75% of all the subjects were also involved with helping in the preparation of meals.

The second aspect of self-sufficiency was the ability to carry out home management tasks. Twenty-two subjects (95.6%) in the 1978 groups and 19 subjects (95%) in the 1980 group did at least one of five basic home management tasks (make bed,

wash/dry dishes, vacuum/sweep/dust, take out garbage, and wash clothes).

The third aspect was handling money. Although 65% of the subjects in both groups had bank accounts, very few had control over their money.

In terms of previous research, the findings here are similar to those of Stanfield (1973). In his study Stanfield found that nearly 90% of the subjects made their beds and took out the garbage. Stanfield, however, did not report any information on the subjects cooking meals or handling money.

Saenger (1957) found that 19% of the subjects in his study were reponsible for looking after where they lived, while another 36% helped regularly in various chores. Saenger reported that 36% of the subjects also helped prepare food. There is no information on what the subjects did ith their money. It would seem that the ability to handle money was not considered as an indicie of self-sufficiency or mentally handicapped adults were not considered capable of handling money.

Lambert (1976) found that less than one-third of the subjects were able to prepare meals without the assistance of others. In terms of home management tasks Lambert found that "the retarded persons surveyed in this study helped out in the home in those areas where they were confronted with the least danger. For example, a majority of the respondents reported

they made beds (78.3 percent), took out garbage, prepared meals, swept, dusted, mopped, and used the telephone (67.6 percent)" (p. 58). Lambert was not able to report a clear indication of whether the subjects could handle their own money. He did note, however, that the subjects had a very limited awareness of the meaning and purpose of money.

Rosen et al., (1977) found, in their study of the community adjustment of former Elwyn Institute residents, that the subjects had a high degree of control over their money. Over 50% of the subjects subscribed to their own telephone, 20% were paying for purchases on credit, and over 60% had bought some form of life insurance. The subjects in this study were functioning at a level far beyond the capabilities of the subjects in any study cited so far.

The data in this study show a group of adults who can look after their basic needs quite adequately in terms of both cooking and looking after their homes. In terms of handling money there is very little data to compare these abilities. The majority of subjects needed some form of supervision to look after their money.

Interaction Level

In terms of interaction level the subjects, in both groups, participated in a wide variety of activities all over their communities. Who they did the activities with was dependent on where they lived and/or worked as well as their ability to

travel independently in their community. Except for interactions with their parents or supervisors the subjects associated with other mentally handicapped adults.

The findings in this study were quite consistent with previous research, especially with respect to with whom the mentally handicapped adults socialized. Lusthaus et al., (1979) found that although the subjects were living in the community they "were virtually living in a world of isolation from non-retarded people around them" (p. 25). Almost all friends were affiliated with other services for mentally handicapped persons.

Stanfield (1973) found that the majority of subjects had friends who they met at a workshop, activity centre, or social recreational programmes like bowling or dances. In contrast to the present study Stanfield reported 62% of the subjects participated in no activities apart from those with their immediate families.

Saenger (1957) found that about 50% of the subjects had friends of their own. There was a wide variety of functioning within the category of friendship ranging from parallel play to going out to movies. In terms of relationships with members of the opposite sex, Saenger found that "only one out of four had friends of the opposite sex" (p. 110). It would appear that in the late 1950's heterosexual relationships for the mentally retarded were not common.

Lambert's (1976) findings were somewhat unclear in this

area because of the way variables were correlated. The findings that were reported showed that the subjects were quite limited in their interactions wherever they lived.

A possible explanation of the differences in the findings in this study are as a result of a combination of the availability of services and programmes with the expectation society has of mentally handicapped adults. It would seem that the subjects in the Lower Mainland area are becoming quite "normalized" (Wolfensberger, 1972) in that they do the same things as non-handicapped people do except they do the activities with other handicapped people.

Vocational Ability

Twenty-two subjects (95.6%) in the 1978 group and 18 subjects (90%) in the 1980 group were working. Of the subjects working, 17 (77.3%) in the 1978 group and 15 (83.3%) in the 1980 group were working in sheltered workshops. The majority of subjects in both groups worked at jobs where simple routines with few decisions and/or gross dexterity was required.

In terms of the previous research the findings here are similar to Rosen et al., (1977) who also reported 90% of the subjects employed. None of the subjects, however, worked in sheltered workshops. Most were employed as kitchen workers, janitors and orderlies. It would seem the former Elwyn residents were quite capable and lived in an area where appropriate jobs were available.

The findings of the present study are also quite different from what has been reported in other descriptive follow-up studies. This is especially so when considering the rate of employment and the availability of jobs.

Lusthaus et al., (1979) found that two-thirds of the subjects were unemployed. From all indications this group was functioning above the skill level for sheltered workshop, but were not able to get jobs in competitive employment. Lusthaus et al. go on to suggest that, "prohibiting discrimination on the basis of handicapping condition; subsidizing retarded people in integrated employment, guaranteeing a respectable wage in sheltered employment; all move in the direction of guaranteeing retarded adults reasonable economic conditions" (p. 25).

Saenger (1957) found that all together there had been an overall rate of employment of 36%. The most interesting aspect of Saenger's findings were the kinds of jobs the subjects had. Most of the subjects worked as delivery boys, janitors, on assembly lines, and loading and unloading trucks. Saenger also reported that many more men than women were able to find work. From the types of jobs available, this finding does not seem too surprising.

The differences between what was found by Saenger (1957) and what was found in the present study can be accounted for by the availability of services for the mentally retarded skill level of jobs, skill level of adults, and economic conditions. There were fewer sheltered workshops in New York City in the

early 1950's, hence the overall high rate of unemployment. There were more jobs like being a store delivery boy or working on a loading dock and adults who could do these jobs. Almost 20 years later the employment picture has changed quite dramatically and at the present time the sheltered workshop for most graduates is the only real alternative.

Lambert (1976) found that about 25% of the subjects were working and the majority of these were in sheltered workshops. Some of the subjects not working were enrolled in special programmes, school, work training, occupational therapy, adult education and another type of training.

The data in the study are very positive in terms of vocational ability. There is a high rate of employment and most subjects seem content with what they are doing. The high rate of employment is due to the existence of sheltered workshops. It is also important to realize that at the present time there are very few alternatives to sheltered employment for these adults.

Educational Status

On an overall basis when the subjects who were taking courses and had taken courses were considered, 16 (69.6%) in 1978 and 19 (95%) in 1980, there was considerable involvement in some form of adult education programmes. The courses taken most often were functional, academic, and a combination of functional and academic.

Saenger (1957) concluded his study by looking at the use of resources and planning for the future. Saenger found that the greatest demands for help were for all aspects of vocational training and special employment services. About 20% of the parents also wanted their children to be able to go to school beyond the age of 17. This data would seem to accurately reflect the needs of the 1950's.

Stanfield (1973) noted the lack of past school programmes. He goes on to suggest that "either the objectives of public education of the moderately retarded must be changed from their present terminal nature or a system of publicly supported post school facilities must be established to assume responsibilities for such graduates" (p. 552).

Katz (1968) found that adult education should be available for mentally handicapped adults. However, the types of courses offered were usually based on skills that the mentally handicapped adults did not have.

The data in this study show that post school educational programmes are an important part of the services now offered to mentally handicapped adults. From the large number of former students involved in the courses, the skill level and content appear appropriate to their needs. The development of post school education programmes, by involving agencies like community colleges and community centres, has increased offerings, where formerly little for mentally handicapped persons was available..

In summary, the study has shown that in terms of mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, vocational ability, and educational status the community adjustment of the mentally retarded adults, who graduated from school in 1978 and 1980 and are living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia, is an overall positive experience for them.

Implications of the Study

The findings in this study have implications for teachers working with students in school programmes for the moderately retarded and social workers, workshop and/or group home supervisors and staff working with these same people once they leave school.

Teaching Practices

The findings in this study strongly suggest the need to continue emphasizing functional skills like using the public transportation system, cooking their food, cleaning their houses, looking after their money, behaving in a socially appropriate manner, and working at a job.

A more effective method of integrating mentally handicapped students into the school setting must also be found; settings in which there are age appropriate role models and meaningful interactions. This would be the basis for mentally handicapped

persons integrating with non-handicapped persons as adults. It is important to qualify these types of statements with the realization that integration must be done to meet the individual needs and abilities of the mentally handicapped students and those non-handicapped peers with whom they will be integrated.

Existing Programmes and Services

Personnel working with mentally handicapped adults must also continue to provide situations where the adults can strengthen old skills and learn new ones. These opportunities are being provided in workshops, educational and social/recreation programmes, and group residences.

The data in this study showed that 13 subjects (56.5%) in the 1978 group and 13 subjects (65%) in the 1980 group still lived with their parents. The implications for MR associations is that many of the parents will not be able to look after their children forever and some form of alternative care will have to be found. Given present trends this will probably be some form of group residence built and supervised by the local MR associations.

There are also implications for the vocational development of the mentally retarded adults. Specifically there are implications for alternatives to sheltered employment. Subjects who can benefit and handle work in a competitive environment should be encouraged to do so, leaving more room for those who

really needed the sheltered environment. Working in competitive employment would also help to increase the contact a mentally retarded adult had with his/her non-handicapped peers. This is not a new issue or one that can be changed overnight especially in the light of recent economic conditions.

Limitations of the Study

Geographic Area

The study was limited to examining a group of moderately retarded adults who lived in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. The reasons for this were the exploratory nature of the study and the limitations of time and money. The results of the study may contain bias particular to the Lower Mainland area and hence limit the generalizability of the findings.

Sample Size

The population of interest were the males and females who graduated in June, 1978 and June, 1980 from schools designated for the trainable mentally retarded. The choice of this population limited the number of potential subjects in an already limited population. It was, therefore, not reasonable to obtain a random sample from this population. The limited number of subjects and their non-random selection again had some effect on the generalizability of the study. The small number

of subjects also made statistical analysis more difficult to complete, i.e. many of the chi-squares could not be considered because of empty cells or cells with frequencies that were too small.

Recommendations for Future Research

This type of study could be done on a provincial basis much like the one done by Lambert (1976). A study conducted at a provincial level would provide an opportunity to randomly sample or indeed interview a population of moderately retarded adults. A large scale study would have results that would be generalizable and would be of interest to the government and other agencies working with the mentally retarded.

Another suggestion for research using follow-up methodology would be to conduct a longitudinal study. The subjects in this study could be interviewed in another five years. "Only by observing the individual over a period of time can we derive insights about his progress in making the adjustment to community living" (Rosen et al., 1977, p. 144).

REFERENCES

Brolin, D.E. Vocational preparation of retarded citizens. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976.

Brolin, D., Durand, R., Kromer, K., & Muller, P. Post-School adjustment of educable retarded students. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1975, 10 (3), 144-148.

Butler, A.J., & Browning, P.L. Methodological issues in the prediction of rehabilitation outcome with the mentally retarded. In H.J. Prehm (Ed.), Rehabilitation research in mental retardation. Eugene: Rehabilitation Research and Training Centre in Mental Retardation, 1970.

Census tracts, population and housing characteristics Vancouver (Vol. 6). Ottawa: The Queen's Printer, 1978.

Chaffin, J.D., Spellman, C.R., Regan, C.E., & Davison, R. Two follow-up studies of former mentally retarded students from the Kansas work-study project. Exceptional Children, 1971, 37, 733-738.

Charney, L. The trainable mentally retarded. In S.A. Kirk & B.B. Weiner (Eds.), Behavioral research on exceptional children. Washington, D.C.: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1963.

Coakley, F. Study of feebleminded wards employed in war industries. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1945, 50, 301-306.

Cobb, H.V. The forecast of fulfillment. New York: Teachers College Press, 1972.

Conley, R.W. The economics of mental retardation. Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1973.

Crain, E.J. Socioeconomic status of educable mentally retarded graduates of special education. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1980, 15 (2), 90-94.

Delp, H.A., & Lorenz, M. Follow-up study of 84 public school special class pupils with IQs below 50. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1953, 58, 175-182.

Dinger, J.C. Post-school adjustment of former educable retarded pupils. Exceptional Children, 1961, 27, 353-360.

Eagle, E. Prognosis and outcome of community placement of institutionalized retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1967, 72, 232-243.

Edgerton, R.B. The cloak of competence. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Edgerton, R.B. Issues relating to the quality of life among mentally retarded persons. In M.J. Begab & S.A. Richardson (Eds.), The mentally retarded and society: A social science perspective. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1975.

Edgerton, R.B., & Bercovici, S.M. The cloak of competence, years later. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1976, 80 (5), 485-597.

Farber, B. Mental retardation: Its social context and social consequences. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.

Farrell, E.E. A preliminary report on the careers of three hundred fifty children who have left ungraded classes. In M. Rosen, G.R. Clark, & M.S. Kivitz (Eds.), The history of mental retardation (Vol. 2). Baltimore: University Park Press, 1976.

Fernald, W. After-care study of the patients discharged from Waverley for a period of twenty-five years. In M.S. Rosen, G.R. Clark, & M.S. Kivitz (Eds.), The history of mental retardation (Vol. 2). Baltimore: University Park Press, 1976.

Gay, L.R. Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976.

Goldberg, I. Elwyn Morey memorial lecture: Adult adjustment of the mentally retarded. Australian Journal of Mental Retardation, 1972, 2 (3), 61-68.

Goldstein, H. Social and occupational adjustment. In H.A. Steven & R. Heber (Eds.)., Mental retardation: A review of research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Gollay, E., Freedman, R., Wyngaarden, M., & Kurtz, N.R. Coming back, the community experience of deinstitutionalized mentally retarded people. Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Books, 1978.

Grant, J.R. Results of institutional treatment of juvenile mental defectives over a 30 year period. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 1956, 75, 918-921.

Grossman, H. Manual on terminology and classification in mental retardation, 1973 version. Washington, D.C.: American Association on Mental Deficiency, 1973.

Gruenberg, E.M. Epidemiology. In H.A. Stevens & R. Heber (Eds.), Mental retardation: A review of research. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Gunzburg, H.C. Social competence and mental handicap. London: Balliere, Tindall & Cassell Ltd., 1968.

Hegge, T.G. The occupational status of higher-grade mental defectives in the present emergency. A study of parolees from the Wayne County Training School of Northville, Michigan. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1944, 49, 86-98.

Henrysson, S. Gathering, analyzing, and using data on test items. In R.L. Thorndike (Ed.), Educational measurement (2nd ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1971.

Irvin, L.K., Halpern, A.S., & Reynolds, W.M. Assessing social and prevocational awareness in mildly and moderately retarded individuals. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1977, 82 (3), 266-272.

Jacobs, T.O. Developing questionnaire items: How to do it well. Alexandria, Va.: Human Resources Research Organization, 1974.

Jewell, A.A. A follow-up study of 190 mentally deficient children excluded because of low mentality from the public schools of the District of Columbia, divisions I-IX, September 1929 to February 1, 1940. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1941, 45, 234-241.

Katz, E. The retarded adult in the community. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.

Kennedy, R.J.A. A Connecticut community revisited; A study of the social adjustment of a group of mentally deficient adults in 1948 and 1960. Hartford, Conn.: Connecticut State Department of Health, Office of Mental Retardation, 1966.

Kerlinger, F.N. Foundation of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.

Kokaska, C.J. The occupational status of the educable mentally retarded: A review of follow-up studies. Journal of Special Education, 1968, 2 (4), 369-377.

Kokaska, O.J., & Kalwara, S. Preparing the retarded for semiskilled and skilled occupations. Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded, 1969, 4 (2), 71-74.

Kolstoe, P. An examination of some characteristics which discriminate between employed and not employed mentally retarded males. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1961, 66 (3), 472-482.

Kolstoe, O.P., & Shafter, A.J. Employability prediction for mentally retarded adults: A methodological note, American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1961, 66 (2), 287-289.

Lambert, C., Jr. Retarded adults, their adjustment and community milieu. Toronto: Ministry of Community and Social Services, 1976.

Lambert, C., Jr., & Bowman, K. Program planning for retarded adults. Toronto: The Ontario Association for the Mentally Retarded, 1977.

Lambert, J., & Racine, H. Considerations on the placement and employment of the mentally deficient. Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, 4 (1), 107-119.

Lambert, N., Windmiller, M., Cole, L., & Figueroa, R. AAMD adaptive behavior scale, public school version (Rev. ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Association on Mental Deficiency, 1975.

Lippman, L. Indications of societal concern for mentally retarded persons. Social Indicators Research, 1976, 3, 181-215.

Lusthaus, E., Hanrahan, J., & Lusthaus, C. Issues in improving quality of life. Mental Retardation, 1979, 29 (3), 24-27.

Maccoby, E.E., & Maccoby, N. The interview: A tool of social science. In G. Lindzey (Ed.), Handbook of social psychology (Vol. 1). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

Marlett, N.J. Adaptive functioning index. Calgary: The Vocational and Rehabilitation Research Institute, 1973.

McCarver, R.B., & Craig, E.M. Placement of the retarded in the community: Prognosis and outcome. In N.R. Ellis (Ed.), International review of research in mental retardation (Vol. 7). New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Meyer, E.L. (Ed.), Planning community services for the mentally retarded. Scranton: International Textbook Co., 1967.

Morgenstern, M., & Michal-Smith, H. Psychology in the vocational rehabilitation of the mentally retarded. Springfield, Ill. Charles C. Thomas, 1973.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K., & Bent, D.H. Statistical package for the social sciences. (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Nihira, K. Factorial dimensions of adaptive behavior in adult retardates. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1969, 73 (6), 868-878.

Nihira, K. Factorial dimensions of adaptive behavior in mentally retarded children and adolescents. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1969, 74 (1), 130-141.

O'Connor, G. Home is a good place: A national perspective of community residential facilities for developmentally disabled persons. Monograph of the American Association of Mental Deficiency, 1976, (No. 2).

Olshansky, S., & Beach, D. A five-year follow-up of mentally retarded clients. Rehabilitation Literature, 1974, 35 (2), 48-49.

Orlich, D.C. Designing sensible surveys. Pleasantville, N.Y.: Docent Corporation, 1978.

Peterson, L., & Smith, L.L. The post-school adjustment of educable mentally retarded adults with that of adults of normal intelligence, Exceptional Children, 1960, 26, 404-408.

Richardson, S.A. Reaction to mental subnormality. In M.J. Begab & S.A. Richardson (Eds.), The mentally retarded and society: A social science perspective. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1975.

Richardson, S.A. Careers of mentally retarded young persons: Services jobs, and interpersonal relations, American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1978, 82 (4), 349-358.

Robinson, N.M., & Robinson, H.B. The mentally retarded child (2nd ed.) New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Rosen, M., Clark, G.R., & Kivitz, M.S. Rehabilitation of the handicapped, new dimensions in programs for the developmentally disabled. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1977.

Saenger, G. The adjustment of severely retarded adults in the community. Albany: New York State Interdepartmental Health Resources Board, 1957.

Saenger, G. Social and occupational adjustment of the mentally retarded. In J. Zubin & G.A. Jervis (Eds.), Psychopathology of mental development. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1967.

Schalock, R.L., Harper, R.S., & Genung, T. Community integration of mentally retarded adults: Community placement and program success. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1981, 85 (5), 478-488.

Scheer, R.M., Hawke, S., & Rice, N.G. Community preparedness for retardates. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1969.

Sigelman, C.K., Schoenrock, C.J., Spanhel, C.L., Hromas, S.G., Winer, J.L., Budd, E.C., & Martin, P.W. Surveying mentally retarded persons: Responsiveness and response validity in three samples. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1980, 84 (5), 479-486.

Social and Community Planning Research. Questionnaire design manual (Technical Manual No. 5). London: Author, 1972.

Social Planning and Review Council of British Columbia. Manpower development services project, phase I, project report, April 1978-August 1979. Vancouver: Author, 1979.

Sparks, H.L., & Younie, W.J. Adult adjustment of the mentally retarded: Implications for teacher education. Exceptional Children, 1969, 36 (1), 13-18.

Stanfield, J.S. Graduation: What happens to the retarded child when he grows up? Exceptional Children, 1973, 39 (7), 548-552.

Stephens, W.B., & Peck, J.R. Success of young adult male retardates. Washington, D.C.: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1968.

Survey Research Center. Interviewer's manual (Rev. ed.) Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, 1976.

Tisdall, W.J. A follow-up study of trainable mentally handicapped children in Illinois. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1960, 65, 11-16.

Tizard, J. Longitudinal studies: Problems and findings. In A.M. Clarke & A.D.B. Clarke (Eds.), Mental deficiency, the changing outlook (3rd ed.). London: Methuen & Co., Ltd., 1974.

Tobias, J. Vocational adjustment of young retarded adults. Mental Retardation, 1970, 8 (3), 13-16.

Tudor, W., Tudor, J., & Gove, W.R. The effect of sex role differences on the societal reaction to mental retardation. Social Forces, 1979, 57 (3), 871-876.

Warwick, D.P., & Lininger, C.A. The sample survey: Theory and practice. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1975.

Willms, J.D. Retarded adults in the community, an investigation of neighbourhood attitudes and concerns. Unpublished masters thesis, University of British Columbia, 1978.

Wilson, W. Social psychology and mental retardation. In N.R. Ellis (Ed.), International review of research in mental retardation (Vol. 4). New York: Academic Press, 1970.

Windle, C.P., Stewart, E., & Brown, S.J. Reasons for community failure of released patients. American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1961, 66, 213-217.

Windle, C.P. Prognosis of mental subnormals. Monograph Supplement to American Journal of Mental Deficiency, 1962, 66 (5), 1-180.

Wolfensberger, W. Vocational preparation and occupation. In A.A. Baumeister (Ed.), Mental Retardation: Appraisal, education, and rehabilitation. Chicago: Aldine, 1967, 232-273.

Wolfensberger, W. The principle of normalization in human services. Toronto: National Institute On Mental Retardation, 1972.

Wolfson, I.N. Follow-up studies of 92 male and 131 female patients who were discharged from the Newark State School in 1946. In M. Rosen, G.R. Clark, & M.S. Kurtz (Eds.), The history of mental retardation (Vol. 2). Baltimore: University Park Press, 1976.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire Used by Lambert

I MOBILITY INDEPENDENCE

1. a) When you go downtown or somewhere else shopping or visiting friends do you ever have trouble getting home?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) Did you get help from the police?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

c) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

d) What happened? _____

2. b) Do you go to work yourself or does someone take you?

_____ 1 self _____ 2 with someone

(IF WITH SOMEONE)

b) Who? _____

c) Have you ever been late for work?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

d) When were you late for work last? _____

e) Why? _____

II SELF-SUFFICIENCY

3. a) Do you eat breakfast here in this house?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no _____ sometimes

(IF NO OR SOMETIMES)

b) Where do you eat breakfast? _____

c) Do you usually cook breakfast yourself or does someone cook it for you?

_____ 1 self _____ 2 someone

(IF SOMEONE)

d) Who cooks it for you? _____

e) Do you help?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

WHAT ABOUT LUNCH.

4. a) Do you each lunch in this house?

_____ yes _____ 2 no _____ 3 sometimes

(IF NO OR SOMETIMES)

b) Where do you eat? _____

c) Do you make your own lunch or does someone make it for you?

_____ 1 self _____ 2 someone

(IF SOMEONE)

d) Who? _____

e) Do you help?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

WHAT ABOUT SUPPER.

5. a) Do you cook your own supper or does someone cook it for you?

_____ 1 self _____ 2 someone

(IF SOMEONE)

b) Who? _____

c) Do you help?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

d) Do you ever set the table before supper?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

e) Why not? _____

f) Do you ever wash the dishes after supper?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

g) Why not? _____

6. a) Do you eat something before you go to bed?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

b) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

c) What do you usually eat before you go to bed? _____

LET US TALK ABOUT THE KINDS OF THINGS YOU DO AROUND THE HOUSE.

IN HOUSEWORK, DO YOU EVER,

	YES	IF NO	
		a) Who does this?	b) Do you help?
1) Sweep, dust, mop			
2) Wash the floor			
3) Wax the floor			
4) Wash linen, bed sheets and towels			

5) Make beds
6) Wash clothes
7) Iron clothes
8) Fix appliances
9) Gardening
10) Take the garbage out
11) Meal preparation tasks, (SPECIFY)
12) Other (SPECIFY)

SO FAR, YOU HAVE TOLD ME A LOT OF THINGS THAT I DID NOT KNOW BEFORE. NOW, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT MONEY.

FIRST OF ALL,

8. a) Where do you get your money from? (MULTIPLE CHECK, PROBE)

___ 1. Salary ___ 5. Friends
___ 2. Parents ___ 6. Government
___ 3. Husband/wife ___ 6. Other (Specify) _____
___ 4. Other relatives ___ 9. Do not know

FOR ALL RESPONDENTS, IF MONEY COMES FROM GOVERNMENT

b) What do you call this money?

___ 1. Salary ___ 5. Friends
___ 2. Parents ___ 6. Government
___ 3. Husband/wife ___ 6. Other (Specify) _____
___ 4. Other relatives ___ 9. Do not know

9. a) About how much money do you get each week, month?

1. Salary _____ 5. Friends _____
2. Parents _____ 6. Government _____
3. Husband/wife _____ 7. Other _____
4. Other Relatives _____ 9. Do not know _____

WHAT DO YOU DO WITH YOUR MONEY?

FOR EXAMPLE,

10. a) Do you pay your rent/room and board?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

b) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

c) Which do you pay; rent, room and board?

_____ 1 rent _____ 2 room and board

d) How much do you pay each week? _____

11.a) Do you have any spending money for yourself each week?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

b) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

c) About how much? _____

d) Do you ever run out of money before your next pay?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

e) Do you ever borrow money from someone?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

f) What do you do when you have no money? _____

(IF YES)

g) From whom did you borrow the money _____

h) Do you own money to him/her now?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

12. a) Do you take care of your own money or does someone take care of it for you?

_____ 1 self _____ 2 someone

(IF SOMEONE)

b) Who? _____

c) Why? _____

13. a) Did you ever borrow money from a (special place)?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF BORROWED)

b) What is the name of the (special place) that you borrowed the money from? _____

c) How long ago was that? _____

d) How did you learn about that (special place)? _____

e) What did you need the money for? _____

f) Do you now owe any money to that (special place)?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NEVER BORROWED)

g) Did you ever try to borrow money from a (special place)?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

h) What is the name of the (special place)? _____

i) How long ago was that? _____

j) How did you learn about that (special place)? _____

k) What did you need the money for? _____

l) What happened? _____

FOR ALL RESPONDENTS

14. a) Have you saved any money?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) What do you save money for? _____

(IF NO)

c) Why not? _____

WITH THE MONEY YOU HAVE YOU CAN DO A LOT OF THINGS YOU LIKE TO DO.

FOR EXAMPLE; YOU CAN GO SHOPPING FOR FOOD, CLOTHING, ETC.

FIRST OF ALL, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT SHOPPING FOR FOOD.

15. a) Do you ever buy your own food?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) What do you usually buy? _____

c) How do you know what to buy? _____

(IF NO)

d) Who buys most of the food in this house? _____

e) Do you usually tell him/her what you like to buy?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

f) Do he/she buy it for you?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

16. a) Do you buy things like cigarettes, candies, pop, beer, etc.

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

b) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

c) About how much do you spend on these things each week?
_____

THE NEXT THINGS WE ARE GOING TO TALK ABOUT IS SHOPPING FOR CLOTHING.

17. a) Do you ever buy your own clothing?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

Does someone take you to buy your clothes?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

c) Who? _____

(IF NO)

d) Why not? _____

e) Does someone buy clothing for you?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

f) Who is it? _____

18. a) Did you ever get any clothing which somebody had used before?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) From whom did you get that clothing? _____

c) Do you like the clothing that you got from him/her?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

19. a) What size of shirt/dress do you take? _____

b) Do you try it on before you take the clothing?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

c) Why? _____

COULD YOU TELL ME THE KINDS OF THINGS YOU HAVE?

20. a) Which of the following things do you have? FOR EXAMPLE,

___ 1. TV ___ 4. Newspapers, books & magazines

___ 2. Record Player ___ 5. Telephone

___ 3. Radio ___ 6. Musical Instruments

b) How did you get these things?

1. TV _____
2. Record Player _____
3. Radio _____
4. Newspapers, books and magazines _____
5. Telephone _____
6. Musical Instruments _____

III INTERACTION LEVEL

WHAT ABOUT PEOPLE AROUND HERE.

21. a) Are they nice to you?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

b) Why is that? _____

c) What around here do you like best? _____

d) What do you like about him/her/them? _____

e) Does/do he/she/they help you when you are having difficulties?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

How? _____

f) Do you help them?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

How? _____

g) Who around here do you not like? _____

h) Why is that? _____

22. a) Do you have any close friends?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) Where are they living now? _____

c) How did you get to know them? (PROBE: Hospital/School/Workshop)

_____

d) Do you see them sometimes?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

e) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

f) How often do you see them? (PROBE: How many times last month) _____

g) Do you usually go to see them or do they come to see you?

_____ 1 respondent see friends

_____ 2 friends see respondent

_____ both

FOR RESPONDENT WHO IS NOT LIVING WITH PARENTS

WHAT ABOUT YOUR PARENTS.

23. a) Are your parents living?

_____ 1 yes, both _____ 2 father living only

_____ 3 mother living only _____ 4 no

(IF NO), SKIP TO QUESTION #41.

(IF YES)

b) Where are they living now? _____

c) Do you see them sometimes

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

d) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

e) How often do you see them? (PROBE: How many times last month) _____

f) Do you usually go to see them or do they come to see you?

_____ 1 respondent sees parent(s)

_____ 2 parent(s) sees respondent

_____ both

FOR RESPONDENT WHO IS LIVING WITH PARENTS

WHAT ABOUT YOUR PARENTS.

24. a) Are they nice to you?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) What kinds of things do they do for you which you like a lot? _____

(IF NO)

c) Why is that? What kinds of things do they do to you which you do not like? _____

d) Do you ever do anything that your parent(s) do not like?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

e) What kinds of things? _____

f) What did you parent(s) say or do to you? _____

g) How did you feel about it? What did you do? _____

h) What are some of th things you do that make your parent(s) happy? _____

ALL RESPONDENTS

25. a) Are you married?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

b) Were you ever married?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

c) When was it? _____

d) What happened? (PROBE: Why is your husband/wife not living here with you?) _____

IF RESPONDENT IS NOT MARRIED, SKIP TO QUESTION 28

FOR RESPONDENT WHO IS LIVING WITH HUSBAND/WIFE/AND CHILDREN

26. a) How long have you been married? _____

b) How did you get to know your husband/wife? _____

c) Is he/she a friend of yours from the Hospital School/Workshop?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

d) Where did you meet him/her? _____

e) Does you husband/wife have a job?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

f) What kind of work is he/she doing on the job? _____

(IF NO)

g) Why not? _____

27. a) Do you have any children?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) How many children do you have? _____

c) How old is/are he/she/they? _____

d) Is/are he/she/they living here with you in this house?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no _____ 3 some yes, some no

FOR RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT MARRIED

WHAT ABOUT BOY/GIRL FRIEND.

28. a) Do you have a boy/girl friend?

girlfriend ____ 1 yes, boyfriend ____ 2 yes, ____ 3 no

(IF YES)

b) How did you get know your boy/girl friend? (PROBE: Hospital School/Workshop) _____

c) How often do you see each other (PROBE: How many times last week?) _____

d) What kinds of places do you go to together? _____

e) Do you plan to get married?

____ 1 yes ____ 2 no

f) When do you plan this? _____

WE ARE ALMOST FINISHED NOW AND YOU HAVE BEEN VERY (CO-OPERATIVE), (HELPFUL), (PATIENT).

BEFORE WE FINISH, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK WITH YOU ABOUT WHAT YOU DO WHEN YOU GO OUT.

29. a) Do you ever go out to have fun?

____ 1 yes ____ 2 no

(IF NO)

b) Why not? _____

c)

YES		IF YES	IF NO
	d) When did you last go?	e) Do you go with someone? f) Who do you usually go with?	g) Why not?

1) Take a trip
2) Visit a museum
3) Visit park, zoo
4) Go shopping

d) What happened? (PROBE: Why is your husband/wife not living here with you?) _____

IF RESPONDENT IS NOT MARRIED, SKIP TO QUESTION 28

FOR RESPONDENT WHO IS LIVING WITH HUSBAND/WIFE/AND CHILDREN

26. a) How long have you been married? _____

b) How did you get to know your husband/wife? _____

c) Is he/she a friend of yours from the Hospital School/Workshop?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

d) Where did you meet him/her? _____

e) Does you husband/wife have a job?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

f) What kind of work is he/she doing on the job? _____

(IF NO)

g) Why not? _____

27. a) Do you have any children?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) How many children do you have? _____

c) How old is/are he/she/they? _____

d) Is/are he/she/they living here with you in this house?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no _____ 3 some yes, some no

FOR RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOT MARRIED

WHAT ABOUT BOY/GIRL FRIEND.

28. a) Do you have a boy/girl friend?

_____ 1 yes, boyfriend _____ 2 yes, girlfriend _____ 3 no

(IF YES)

b) How did you get know your boy/girl friend? (PROBE: Hospital School/Workshop) _____

c) How often do you see each other (PROBE: How many times last week?) _____

d) What kinds of places do you go to together? _____

e) Do you plan to get married?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

f) When do you plan this? _____

WE ARE ALMOST FINISHED NOW AND YOU HAVE BEEN VERY (CO-OPERATIVE), (HELPFUL), (PATIENT).

BEFORE WE FINISH, I WOULD LIKE TO TALK WITH YOU ABOUT WHAT YOU DO WHEN YOU GO OUT.

29. a) Do you ever go out to have fun?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

b) Why not? _____

c)

	YES	IF YES		IF NO
	d) When did you last go?	e) Do you go with someone?	f) Who do you usually go with?	g) Why not?
1) Take a trip				
2) Visit a museum				
3) Visit park, zoo				
4) Go shopping				

5) Bowling
6) Movies
7) Swimming
8) Dancing
9) Other (PROBE)

h) When you go out, do you take a bus/street car/subway?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

i) Why not? _____

j) Do you have a car or bicycle to get around?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

k) Which do you have?

___ 1. Bicycle ___ 3. Car

___ 2. Motor bike ___ 4. Other (specify)

30. a) Do these things keep you from going out?

	YES	NO
Do not have enough friends to go out with.		
Do not have enough money.		
Do not have enough things to do.		
People are not nice to you.		
The place you want to go are too far from home.		
Other (specify)		

IV VOCATIONAL ABILITY

COMMEND RESPONDENT ON ANSWERING QUESTIONS, ON SPENDING TIME WITH YOU.

WHAT ABOUT A JOB FOR PAY.

31. a) Do you have a job for pay?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

IF NOT WORKING, SKIP TO QUESTION #28

(IF WORKING)

b) What is the name of the place where you are working now?

_____

c) How long have you been working there?

_____ _____
Year Months

d) Do you go to work everyday? (How many days a week do you work?)

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

32. a) What do you do on your job at work? _____

b) What other things do you do at work? _____

c) What are some of the things you like best about your job? _____

d) What are some of the things that you do not like about your job? _____

33. a) What things about your work are most difficult for you to do? _____

b) Do you think your training programme could have helped make your work easier for you to do?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

c) How? _____

(IF NO)

d) Why not? _____

34. a) Who is your boss at work? (DO NOT WRITE NAME OF THE BOSS)

_____ 1 Miss, Mrs., Mr. _____ 2 First Name _____ 3 Do not know

b) Does he/she help you when you have difficulties at work?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

c) Why not? _____

d) What do you do about the difficulties you have at work? _____

(IF YES)

e) How? Tell me something about he/she helps you when you have difficulties at work? _____

f) Does your boss ever get angry at you?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

g) What was the matter? _____

h) How did you feel about it? _____

35. a) Did you work somewhere else before this job?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) What is the name of the place you worked before? _____

c) Did you go to work everyday? (How many days in a week did you work?)

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

d) What did you do on your job there? _____

e) How long did you work there?

_____ _____
Year Months

f) Which job is best; the one you are now working at, or the one you worked at before?

_____ 1 the present one _____ 2 the previous one

g) Why? _____

36. a) Would you rather be doing some other kind of work than what you do now?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO), SKIP TO QUESTION #40.

(IF YES)

b) What kind of work would you rather do? _____

c) Why would you rather be doing that? _____

d) Are you doing anything about it?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

e) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

f) What are you doing about it? _____

g) Have you applied for a job like the one you like?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

h) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

i) How did you hear about this job? _____

j) Were you interviewed?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

k) What happened? _____

IF WORKING, SKIP TO QUESTION #40.

37. Are you enrolled in any special programmes?

		NAME AND LOCATION
___	1. School	_____
___	2. Work Training	_____
___	3. Occupational Therapy	_____
___	4. Adult Education	_____
___	5. Other (Specify)	_____

38. a) Did you ever work at a job before.

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

b) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

c) What is the name of the place where you worked before? _____

d) Did you go to work everyday (How many days in a week did you work?) _____

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

e) What did you do on your job there? _____

f) How long did you work there?

_____ _____
Year Months

g) How long has it been since you last worked?

_____ _____
Year Months

h) Why are you not working now? _____

39. a) Did you ever apply for a job?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO): CAUTION: DO NOT ASK THE FOLLOWING QUESTION IF RESPONDENT IS NOT IN A POSITION TO WORK, (SPECIFY, WHY).

b) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

c) What kind of job did you apply for? _____

d) How did you hear about this job? _____

e) Were you interviewed? _____

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

f) What happened? _____

ASK ALL RESPONDENTS

40. a) Are jobs hard to get?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

b) Why is that? _____

c) Do you think you have enough training for a job you would like to do?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

d) What kinds of things did you learn in the training programme which would help you get a job? _____

(IF NO)

e) Do you think you could get a job you like to do if the training programme had been better?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

f) How do you think the training programme should change? _____

(IF NO)

g) Why not? _____

41. a) Did anyone ever try to help you find a job?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF YES)

b) Who is it? _____

c) How did he/she help? _____

d) What happened? _____

41. a) Did you ever go to any special offices where you might be helped to find a job?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

(IF NO)

b) Why not? _____

(IF YES)

c) What is the name of the office, or where is it? _____

d) When did you last go? _____

e) What did they say to you? _____

f) What happened? _____

g) Where the people in the special office nice to you?

_____ 1 yes _____ 2 no

h) Why do you think this so? _____

APPENDIX B

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS AND EXPLANATION OF INTERVIEW

INTERVIEW-PROMPT RECORDING SHEET USED IN PILOT STUDY

The following is the format of the interviews conducted in the pilot study and main study of this research project.

The principal investigator identified himself at the door and indicated that he was from the University of British Columbia where he was conducting a study on people who went to _____ School. (The interviewer mentioned the appropriate school).

> Good afternoon/evening, my name is Marvin Enkin. I am a student at the University of British Columbia where I am conducting a study on people who graduated from _____ School to see what kinds of things they do everyday. I would like to come in and talk with you about this.

The principal investigator established further rapport and put the subject and parent/guardian at ease by answering any questions that they may have had, or by making appropriate 'small talk'.

The principal investigator next indicated that he wanted to talk to the subject and parent/guardian in a room where it was quiet. The principal investigator then began to explain what the interview was going to be like.

> I would like to talk to you and your parent(s)/supervisor in a room where it is quiet. I would like to take about an hour of your time to ask you some questions about the kinds of things you do at home and work everyday. There are no right or wrong answers. I want you to answer the questions as best you can. You do not even have to put your name on this paper (subject was shown questionnaire).

Before beginning the questionnaire the principal investigator reminded the subject that he/she did not have to

participate in the study if he/she did not want to.

> Before we start, I want you to know that you do not have to answer these questions. Your help is important in finding out some useful information. Other people who went to _____ School are also answering these questions. Would you like to answer these questions for me? Thank you very much.

After a subject agreed to participate, he/she was told that breaks were allowed. Also, if it was apparent the subject was having a hard time concentrating there was a five to ten minute break as necessary.

> If you get tired or need to go to the washroom, please let me know and we will stop for a few minutes.

At the conclusion of the interview, the interviewer thanked the subject and parent/guardian for their time and cooperation.

> Thank you for taking this time to answer all the questions. You have given me a lot of important information. Thank you for your cooperation.

When leaving, the interviewer shook hands with the subject and parent/guardian.

> Goodbye/good night. Thank you again. It was nice meeting you.

Code No. _____

CONFIDENTIAL: All information which would permit identification of any individual will be held strictly confidential and will be used only by the principal investigator. The data will not be disclosed to others for any purpose.

I GENERAL INFORMATION

This section to be answered by all Ss.

Most items can be answered by placing a check ( ) in the appropriate blank at the right of each line. Please fill in necessary information where requested for other questions.

1. Gender:

   Male _____

   Female _____

2. Age:

   How old are you? _____

3. Schooling:

a) What school did you attend? (Check all that apply)		b) How long did you go to each school? (Fill in number of years)
Annieville	_____	_____
Arthur Peake	_____	_____
Crestwood	_____	_____
Donald Paterson	_____	_____
George Greenaway	_____	_____
Oakridge	_____	_____
Prince George	_____	_____
Simon Cunningham	_____	_____
Sunny Cedars	_____	_____
Sunny Park	_____	_____
Tillicum	_____	_____
Other (specify)	_____	_____
Refused/ Cannot respond	_____	_____

4. City or town where S lives now:

Burnaby	_____
Coquitlam	_____
Delta	_____
Langley	_____
New Westminster	_____
North Vancouver	_____
Port Coquitlam	_____
Port Moody	_____
Richmond	_____
Surrey	_____
Vancouver	_____
West Vancouver	_____
White Rock	_____
Other (specify)	_____

5. Marital Status:
Are you?

Single	_____
Married	_____
Living with someone	_____
Separated	_____
Divorced	_____
Refused/Cannot respond	_____

6. Does S live-
(Interviewer observation - if not clear ask S)

In extended care facility (hospital)	_____
With parents	_____
Other relatives (specify) _____	_____
In a boarding/group home	_____
With friends	_____
With spouse (and children)	_____
Alone	_____
Other (specify) _____	

7. How long have you been living with/in _____

Less than 6 months	_____
6 months-1 year	_____
1-2 years	_____
2-3 years	_____
4-5 years	_____
6-10 years	_____
More than 10 years	_____
Refused/Cannot respond	_____ (Go to question 8(a))

II MOBILITY INDEPENDENCE

This section to be answered by all Ss.

8. a) When you went out this last week, how did you travel around? (Check all that apply)

b) How often - how many times per week?

Bus (Easter Seal)	_____	_____	See question 8(c)
Car (family/friends drive)	_____	_____	
Taxi	_____	_____	
Bicycle	_____	_____	
Car (drive yourself)	_____	_____	(See 8(d))
Bus (B.C. Hydro)	_____	_____	(See 8(e))
Other (specify) _____		_____	

c) For those checked above, where did you go (what places)?

Bus (Easter Seal) _____
Car (family/friends drive) _____
Taxi _____
Bicycle _____

d) Car (drive yourself)

Do you know how to drive? Yes _____ No _____
Do you have a drivers' licence? Yes _____ No _____

Where do you go when your drive a car by yourself this last week? _____

3) Bus (B.C. Hydro)

Did you travel by yourself on the bus this last week? Yes _____ No _____

Did you use a transfer to change from one bus to another bus this last week? Yes _____ No _____

Where did you go on a B.C. Hydro bus this last week?

_____

9.a) When you went downtown or somewhere else shopping or visiting your friends this last week, did you have trouble finding your way around (Probe - Did you get lost?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 9(b))
No _____ (Go to question 10(a))

b) If Yes, what kind of trouble? (Check all that apply)

Took the wrong bus _____
Walked in the wrong direction _____
Other (specify) _____

c) How did you solve your problem of being lost?

_____

III SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Questions in this section are for all Ss.

10. a) Did you make/cook any of your own meals this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 10(b))
No _____ (Go to question 11(a))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 12(a))

b) If yes, Which meals did you make (Check all that apply)

c) How often? (Probe-How many times per week?)

Breakfast	_____	_____
Lunch	_____	_____
Supper	_____	_____
Snack	_____	_____

d) What kinds of things did you make to cook for- (Probe-What did you make to eat for-)

Breakfast _____
Lunch _____
Supper _____
Snack _____

11. If S did not cook any meals this last week -

a) Do you know how to cook?

Yes _____
No _____ Why not? _____

b) Who made/cooked the meals for you this last week?

Mother/father _____
Sister/brother _____
Other (specify) _____

c) Did you help make any meals this last week?

Yes _____ In what way did you help? (Probe-what kinds of things did you do to help?
_____

No _____ Why didn't you help? (Probe-Can you give me some reasons for not helping?
_____

12. a) Did you do any work/jobs around the house this last week? (Probe - Do you help with cleaning/taking care of the house?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 12(b))
No _____ (Go to question 13(a))
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to question 14)

b) If yes, did you- (Check all that apply)		c) How often? (Probe- How many times per week?)
Vacuum/sweep floors/carpets	_____	_____
Wash/iron clothes	_____	_____
Wash dishes	_____	_____
Make beds	_____	_____
Gardening (cut the lawn)	_____	_____
Take out garbage	_____	_____
Other (specify) _____	_____	_____

13. If S did not do any jobs/work around the house this last week-

a) Do you know how to:	YES	NO	WHY NOT?
Vacuum/sweep floors/carpets	_____	_____	_____
Wash/iron clothes	_____	_____	_____
Wash dishes	_____	_____	_____
Make beds	_____	_____	_____
Gardening (cut the lawn)	_____	_____	_____
Take out garbage	_____	_____	_____
Other (specify) _____	_____	_____	_____

b) Who did these jobs for you last week?

Mother/father _____
Sister/brother _____
Other (specify) _____

c) Did you help with any of the jobs this last week?

Yes _____ In what way did you help? (Probe-What kinds of things did you do to help?)

_____

No _____ Why didn't you help? (Probe-Can you give me some reasons for not helping?)

_____

14. Where does the money you live on each month come from? (Probe - How did you get it?) (Check all that apply)

Government (GAIN) _____
Parents _____
Work _____
Other (specify) _____
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to question 15(a).)

15. a) Do you have your own bank account? (Probe-Do you keep money in the bank?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 15(b))
No _____ (Go to question 15(c))

b) If Yes-
Do you save any money?

Yes _____ What are you saving for? _____
No _____ Why not? _____

c) If no, who takes care of your money for you?

_____

16. Who pays for-

	SELF	SOMEONE ELSE
Rent	_____	_____
Groceries (food)	_____	_____
Clothes	_____	_____

17. Did you have any spending money this week? (Probe-Did you have some money to buy things this week?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 18)
No _____ (Go to question 19)

18. If Yes,

a) Who decided how much money you could have for the week? _____

b) What did you do with your money this week? (Probe-What did you buy with your money?) (Check all that apply)

Use as probes

Candy, cigarettes, beer _____
Swimming _____
Bowling _____

Restaurant (MacDonald's, White Spot, etc.) _____

Other (specify) _____

Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 20(a))

19. If no,
Why didn't you have any spending money this last week?
_____

IV INTERACTION LEVEL

This section to be answered by all Ss.

20. Did you go out anywhere this last week, besides work? (Probe-Did you go out to do different kinds of things last week?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 20(b))
No _____ (Go to question 20(e))
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to questions 21-24 or 25-29)

b) If Yes,- Where did you go/What did you do? (Check all that apply)		c) How often: (Probe-How many times per week?)
Bowling	_____	_____
Swimming	_____	_____
Dancing	_____	_____
Parties	_____	_____
Movies	_____	_____
Restaurants (MacDonald's, White Spot, etc.)	_____	_____
Parks (Stanley Park, or any park near home)	_____	_____
Other (specify) _____		_____

d) When you went out, who did you go with? (Check all that apply)

Parents _____
Brother/sister _____
Boy/girl friend _____
Other friends _____
Alone _____
Other (specify) _____

e) If No, why didn't you go? (Probe-Can you tell me some reasons?

Did not have enough friends to go out with _____
Did not have enough money _____
Difficulty with transportation _____
Activities/places too far from home _____
Other (specify) _____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are living with their parent(s):

21. Why are you living with your parents?
(Probe-Can you give me some reasons?)

_____

_____

22. a) Did you spend time with your parents(s)?

Yes _____ (Go to question 22(b))
No _____ (Go to question 22(c))

b) If Yes, what kinds of things/activities did you do with your parent(s)? (Check all that apply)

In House:

Use as Probes
- Eat meals together _____
- Play games (cards, etc.) _____
- Watch TV _____
- Other (specify) _____

Out of House:

Use as Probes
- Eat in restaurant _____
- Go swimming _____
- Go bowling _____
- See a movie _____
- Go shopping _____
- Other (specify) _____

c) If No, who did you spend time with?

- Boy/girl friend _____
- Other friends _____
- Other (specify) _____

23. a) Did your parents help you to do things this last week?

Yes _____ How did they help?
_____

No _____ What kind of help would you like?
_____

24. a) Would you like to change with whom/where you are now living?

Yes _____ (Go to question 24(b))
No _____ (Go to question 30(a))

b) If Yes, would you like to live -
(If S names a person/place, ask relationship or what place is and check off appropriate category)

In extended care facility (hospital) _____

With parents _____

Other relatives (specify) _____

In a boarding/group home _____

With friends _____

With spouse (and children) _____

Alone _____

Other (specify) _____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are not living with their parents:

25. a) Are your parents living?

Yes - both _____
Yes - father _____ (Go to question 25(b))
Yes - mother _____
No _____ (Go to question 28(a))
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to question 28(a))

If Yes-
Why are you not living with your parents?

_____

_____

26. a) If parent(s) is/are living, did you see your parent(s) this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 26(b))
No _____ (Go to question 26(c))

b) If Yes -
What kinds of things/activities did you do with your parent(s)? (Probe-in parents' house/out of parents' house).

_____

_____

c) If No, why did you not see your parent(s) this last week? (Probe-Can you give me some reasons?)

Difficulty with transportation _____
Live too far away _____
Other (specify) _____

27. a) Did you speak to your parent(s) on the telephone?

Yes _____ (Go to question 27(b))
No _____ (Go to question 27(c))
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to question 28(a))

b) If Yes, how often did you speak to your parent(s) this last week? (Probe-How many times?)

Once _____
Twice _____
Three times _____
More than three times _____
Every day _____

c) If No, why did you not speak to your parent(s) on the telephone last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

No telephone _____
Don't know how to use telephone _____
Other (specify) _____

28. a) Did someone where you live help you to do things this last week?

Yes _____
No _____
Refused/Cannot respond _____

If Yes -
Who helped? _____

How did they help? _____

c) If No -
What kind of help would you like?
_____

29. a) Would you like to change with whom/where you are now living?

Yes _____ (Go to question 29(b))
No _____ (Go to question 30)

b) If Yes, would you like to live-
(If S names a person/place, aske relationship or what place is and check off appropriate category)

In extended care facility (hospital) _____
With parents _____
Other relatives (specify) _____
In a boarding/group home _____
With friends _____
With spouse (and children) _____
Alone _____
Other (specify) _____

Questions 30 to 33 for all Ss.

30. a) Did you see your brothers/sisters, aunts/uncles, cousins or grandmother/grandfather this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 31(a))
No _____ (Go to question 32)
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to question 33(a))

31. a) If Yes, who did you see? (Check all that apply)

b) How often? (Probe - How many times per week?)

Use as Probes			
	Brothers/sisters	_____	_____
	Aunts/uncles	_____	_____
	Cousins	_____	_____
	Grandmother/father	_____	_____

c) What kinds of things/activities did you do with your brothers/sisters, (etc.)?

_____

_____

32. If No, why did you not see your brother/sisters (etc.) this last week? (Probe-Can you give me some reasons?)

Difficulty with transportation _____
Live too far away _____
Other (specify) _____

33. a) Did you speak to your brothers/sisters (etc.) on the telephone this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 33(b))
No _____ (Go to question 33(d))
Refused/Cannot respond _____

b) If Yes, who did you speak to? (Check all that apply)

c) How often? (Probe - How many times per week?)

Brothers/sisters	_____	_____
Aunts/uncles	_____	_____
Cousins	_____	_____
Grandmother/father	_____	_____

d) If No, why did you not speak to your brothers/sisters (etc.) on the telephone this last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

No telephone _____
Don't know how to use telephone _____
Other (specify) _____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are not married.

34. a) Do you have a boy/girl friend? (Probe - a special person that you like very much and that person likes you in the same way)

Yes - boy friend	_____	(Go to question 34(b))
Yes - girl friend	_____	(Go to question 34(b))
No - boy/girl friend	_____	(Go to question 37(a))
Refused/Cannot respond	_____	(Go to question 37(a))

b) If Yes -
Do you live and/or work in the same place as your boy/girl friend?

Yes _____ (See everyday)
No _____

c) If No -
Do you have a boy/girl friend that you see away from where you live and/or work?

Yes _____
No _____

35. a) If Yes -
How often did you see your boy/girl friend this last week? (Probe-How many times?)

_____

b) What did you and your boy/girl friend do/Where did you go this last week? (Probe - sporting activities, parties, dancing, etc.)

_____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are married or living with someone.

36. a) How long have you been married/living with someone?

Less than 6 months _____
6 months - 1 year _____
2 - 3 years _____
More than 2 years _____
Refused/Cannot respond _____

b) How did you get to know your husband/wife-boy/girl friend?

_____

c) Do you have any children?

Yes _____
No _____

d) If Yes,

Number	Gender	Ages
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

This section to be answered by all Ss.

37. a) Do you have any (other) good friends? (Probe- friends other than your boy/girl friend?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 37(b))
No _____ (Go to question 37(c))
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to question 39(a))

If Yes-
Do you live and/or work in the same place as most of your good friends?

Yes _____ (See every day)
No _____

c) If No-
Do you have good friends that you see away from where you live and/or work?

Yes _____
No _____

38. a) If Yes-
How often did you see your good friends this last week? (Probe - How many times?)

_____

b) What did you and your good friends do/Where did you go this last week? (Probe - Sporting activities, parties, dancing, etc.)

_____

V VOCATIONAL ABILITY

This section to be answered by all Ss.

39. a) Do you have a job now? (Probe - What do you do to earn money?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 39(b))
No _____ (Go to question 41(a))
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to question 41(a))

b) If Yes, is this job:
(Probe - Do you work every day/all day?)

Full-time _____
Part-time _____

c) How long have you had this job?

Less than 6 months _____
6 months - 1 year _____
2 - 3 years _____
More than 3 years _____
Refused/Cannot respond _____

d) Where do you work? (Probe - if name given, ask what kind of place?)

Workshop _____
Factory _____
Office _____
Store _____
Hospital _____
Other (specify) _____

e) Name of the place you work at:

_____

(From information determine whether this is-)

Competitive _____
Sheltered _____

f) What did you do at work today? (Probes - What was your job?/What did you do when you were working?)

_____

_____

(Get brief description of job)

40. a) Did you work somewhere else before this job?

Yes _____ (Go to question 40(b))
No _____ (Go to question 40(g))
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to question 43)

If Yes, was this job:
(Probe - Did you work every day/all day?)

Full-time _____
Part-time _____

c) How long did you have this job?

Less than 6 months _____
6 months - 1 year _____
2 - 3 years _____
More than 3 years _____
Refused/Cannot respond _____

d) Where did you work? (Probe - if name given, ask what kind of place?)

Workshop _____
Factory _____
Office _____
Store _____
Hospital _____
Other (specify)
_____

e) Name of place you worked at:

_____

(From information determine whether this is-

Competitive _____
Sheltered _____

f) What did you do at work? (Probe - What was your job?)

_____

_____

(Get brief description of job)

g) If No, what were you doing instead of working?

School _____
Unemployed _____
Other (specify) _____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are not presently working.

41. a) Have you every worked before? (Probe - Did you ever have a job to earn money?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 41(b))
No _____ (Go to question 41(g)
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Go to question 43(a))

b) If Yes, was this job:
(Probe - Did you work every day/all day?)

Full-time _____
Part-time _____

c) How long did you have this job?

Less than 6 months _____
6 months - 1 year _____
2 - 3 years _____
More than 3 years _____
Refused/Cannot respond _____

d) Where did you work? (Probe - If name given, ask what kind of place?)

Workshop _____
Factory _____
Office _____
Store _____
Hospital _____
Other (specify) _____

e) Name of place you worked at:

_____

(From information determine whether this was:)
Competitive _____
Sheltered _____

f) What did you do at work (Probe - What was your job?)

_____

_____
(Get brief description of job)

g) If No, what were you doing instead of working?)

School _____
Unemployed _____
Other (specify) _____

42. a) Are you looking for work now?

Yes _____ (Go to question 42(b))
No _____ (Go to question 42(c))
Refused/Cannot respond _____

b) If Yes, how long have you been looking for work?

Less than 6 months _____
6 months - 1 year _____
2 - 3 years _____
More than 3 years _____

c) If No, what are you doing instead of looking for work?

_____

VI EDUCATIONAL STATUS

Questions 43 to 45 are for all Ss.

43. a) Are you now enrolled in/attending any adult night school programmes? (Probe - Are you going to school after work/during the day?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 44(a))
No _____ (Go to question 45(a))
Refused/Cannot respond _____ (Finish)

44. a) If Yes, where are you going to school?

_____

b) What kinds of things are you learning?

_____

c) Have you gone to this type of programme before?

Yes _____
No _____

45. a) If No, would you like to go to an adult school programme?

Yes _____
No _____

b) Have you ever gone to an adult school programme?

Yes _____ Which one? _____
No _____

To be filled out by the interviewer at the end of the interview.

Date of Interview _____

Duration of Interview _____

Interviewer _____

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW-PROMPT RECORDING SHEET USED IN MAIN STUDY

Code No. _____ _

Confidential: All information which would permit identification of any individual will be held strictly confidential and will be used only by the principal investigator. The data will not be disclosed to others for any purpose.

I GENERAL INFORMATION

This section to be answered by all Ss .

Most items can be answered by placing a check ( ) in the appropriate blank at the right of each line. Please fill in necessary information where requested for other questions.

1. Gender:

   Male _____
   Female _____

2. Age:

   How old are you? _____

3. Schooling:

   a) What school did you go to? (Check all that apply)

   b) How long did you go to each school? (Fill in number of years)

Annieville	_____	_____
Arthur Peake	_____	_____
Crestwood	_____	_____
Donald Paterson	_____	_____
George Greenaway	_____	_____
Oakridge	_____	_____
Prince Charles	_____	_____
Simon Cunningham	_____	_____
Sunny Cedars	_____	_____
Sunny Park	_____	_____
Tillicum	_____	_____
Other (specify)	_____	_____
Refused/Cannot respond	_____	

(3(b) Probes - How old were you when you started school? How old were you when you finished school?)

4. Which city/town do you live in now? (Probe - What is your address? Where do you live in British Columbia?)

Burnaby	_____
Coquitlam	_____
Delta	_____
Langley	_____
New Westminster	_____
North Vancouver	_____
Port Coquitlam	_____
Port Moody	_____
Richmond	_____
Surrey	_____
Vancouver	_____
West Vancouver	_____
White Rock	_____
Other (specify)	_____

5. Marital Status:

Are you: (Probe - Have you ever been married?)

Single	_____
Married	_____
Living with someone	_____
Separated	_____
Divorced	_____
Refused/Cannot respond	_____

6. Where do you live/Who do you live with?

In extended care facility (hospital)	_____
With parents	_____
Other relatives (specify)	_____
In a boarding house/group home	_____
With friends	_____
With spouse (and children)	_____
Alone	_____
Other (specify)	_____

7. How long have you been living with/in _____.

_____ (Go to question 8(a))

II MOBILITY INDEPENDENCE

THIS SECTION TO BE ANSWERED BY ALL SS .

I have some questions that I want to ask you about how you travel when you go out.

8. a) When you went out this past week, how did you travel? (Probe - What are some of the ways you went different places?

(Check all that apply)

b) How often - how many times per week?

Bus (Easter Seal)	_____	_____
Car (family/friends drive)	_____	_____
Taxi	_____	_____
Bicycle	_____	_____
Car (drive yourself)	_____	_____
Bus (B.C. Hydro)	_____	_____
Other (Specify) _____		_____

See question 8(c)

See 8(d)

See 8(e)

c) For those checked above, where did you go (what places)?

Bus (Easter Seal) _____
Car (family/friends drive) _____
Taxi _____
Bicycle _____

d) Car (drive yourself)

Do you know how to drive? Yes _____ No _____
Do you have a drivers' license? Yes _____ No _____
Where did you go when you drove a car by yourself this last week? _____

e) Bus (B.C. Hydro)

Did you travel by yourself on the bus this last week? Yes _____ No _____
Who did you travel with? _____

Did you use a transfer to change from one bus to another bus this last week? Yes _____ No _____

Where did you go on a B.C.Hydro bus this last week?

_____

If S does not travel independently, Question 9 should not be asked.

9. a) When you went downtown or somewhere else shopping or visiting friends last week, did you have trouble finding your way around (Probe - Did you get lost?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 9(b))
No _____ (Go to question 10(a))

b) If Yes, what kind of trouble? (Check all that apply)

Took the wrong bus _____
Walked in the wrong direction _____
Other (specify) _____

c) How did you solve your problem of being lost? (Probe - How did you find the right way to go?)

_____

III SELF-SUFFICIENCY

Questions in this section are for all Ss.

In this section, I am going to ask you some questions about the kinds of things you do around the house where you live.

10. a) Did you make/cook any of your own meals this last week?
Yes _____ (Go to question 10(b))
No _____ (Go to question 11(a))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 12(a))

b) If Yes, which meals did you make? (Check all that apply)

c) How often? (Probe - How many times per week?)

Use as Probes
(Breakfast _____ _____
(Lunch _____ _____
(Supper _____ _____
(Snack _____ _____

d) What kinds of things did you cook for: (Probe - What did you make to eat for:)

Use as Probes
(Breakfast _____
(Lunch _____
(Supper _____
(Snack _____

11. If S did not cook any meals this last week-

a) Do you know how to cook?
Yes _____
No _____ Why not? _____

b) Who made/cooked the meals for you this last week?

Mother/father _____
Sister/brother _____
Other (specify) _____

c) Did you help make any meals this last week?

Yes _____ In what way did you help? (Probe - What kinds of things did you do to help?)
_____

No _____ Why didn't you help? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons for not helping?)
_____

12. a) Did you do any work/jobs around the house where you live this last week? (Probe - Do you help with cleaning/taking care of the house where you live?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 12(b))
No _____ (Go to question 13(a))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 14)

b) If yes, did you-
(Check all that apply)

d) How often? (Probe - How many times per week?)

Use as Probes
(Vacuum/sweep floors/carpets _____ _____
(Wash/iron clothes _____ _____
(Wash dishes _____ _____
(Make beds _____ _____
(Gardening (Cut the lawn) _____ _____
(Take out garbage _____ _____
Other (specify) _____ _____
_____ _____

13. If S did not do any jobs/work around the house this last week -

a) Do you know how to:	YES	NO	WHY NOT?
(Use following as probes)			
Vacuum/sweep floors/carpets	_____	_____	_____
Wash/iron clothes	_____	_____	_____
Wash dishes	_____	_____	_____
Make beds	_____	_____	_____
Gardening (Cut the lawn)	_____	_____	_____
Take out garbage	_____	_____	_____
Other (specify) _____	_____	_____	_____

b) Who did these jobs for you last week?
Mother/father _____
Sister/brother _____
Other (specify) _____

c) Did you help with any of the jobs this last week?

Yes _____ In what way did you help? (Probe - What kinds of things did you do to help?)
_____

No _____ Why didn't you help? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons for not helping?)
_____

Now I am going to ask you some questions about money.

14. Where does the money you live on each month come from? (Probe - How did you get it?) (Check all that apply)

Government (GAIN) _____
Parents _____
Work _____
Other (specify) _____
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 15(a))

15. a) Do you have your own bank account? (Probe - Do you keep money in the bank?

Yes _____ (Go to question 15(b))
No _____ (Go to question 15(c))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 16)

b) If Yes, do you save any money?

Yes _____ What are you saving for?
_____

No _____ Why not?
_____

c) If No, who takes care of your money for you?
_____

With your money you can do a lot of things.

16. Who pays for:	SELF	SOMEONE ELSE (WHO?)
Rent	_____	_____
Groceries	_____	_____
Clothes	_____	_____

17. Did you have any spending money this week? (Probe - Did you have some money to buy things this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 18)
No _____ (Go to question 19)

18. If Yes,

a) Who decided how much money you could have for the week? _____

b) What did you do with your money this week? (Probe - What did you buy with your money?) (Check all that apply)

Use as Probes
(Candy, cigarettes, beer _____
(Swimming _____
(Bowling _____
(Restaurant (MacDonald's, White Spot, etc.) _____
Other (Specify) _____
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 20(a))

19. If No, why didn't you have any spending money this last week?

_____

IV INTERACTION LEVEL

This section to be answered by all Ss.

20. a) Did you go out anywhere this last week besides work? (Probe - Did you go out to do different kinds of things this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 20 (b))
No _____ (Go to question 20 (e))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to questions 21-24 or 25-29)

	b) If Yes, Where did you go/ What did you do? (Check all that apply)		c) How often: (Probe-How many times per week?	d) Who did you go out with?
Use as Probes	(Bowling	_____	_____	_____
	(Swimming	_____	_____	_____
	(Dancing	_____	_____	_____
	(Parties	_____	_____	_____
	(Movies	_____	_____	_____
	(Restaurants (MacDonald's, White Spot, etc.)	_____	_____	_____
	(Parks (Stanley Park, or any park near home)	_____	_____	_____
	(Other (Specify)			
	_____	_____	_____	_____

e) If No, why didn't you go? (Probe - Can you tell me some reasons?)

Did not have enough friends to go out with _____
Did not have enough money _____
Difficulty with transportation _____
Activities/places too far from home _____
Other (Specify) _____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are living with their parents:

21. Why are you living with your parents? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

_____
_____
_____

22. a) Did you spend time with your parent(s) this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 22(b))
No _____ (Go to question 22(c))

b) If Yes, What kinds of things/activities did you do with your parent(s)? (Check all that apply)

In the house:

Use as Probes:
- Eat meals together _____
- Play games (cards, etc.) _____
- Watch TV _____
- Other (Specify) _____

Out of the house:

Use as Probes:
- Eat in restaurant _____
- Go swimming _____
- Go bowling _____
- See a movie _____
- Go shopping _____
- Other (Specify) _____

c) If No, who did you spend time with?

Boy/girl friend _____
Other friends _____
Other (Specify) _____

23. a) Did your parents help you to do things this last week?

Yes _____ How did they help?
_____

No _____ What kind of help would you like?
_____

Continuation of questions only for Ss who are living with their parent(s)

24. a) Would you like to change with whom/where you are now living?

Yes _____ (Go to question 24(b))
No _____ (Go to question 30(a))

b) If Yes, would you like to live-
(If S names a person/place, ask relationship or what place is and check off appropriate category)

In extended care facility (hospital) _____
With parents _____
Other relatives (Specify) _____
In a boarding/group home _____
With friends _____
With spouse (and children) _____
Alone _____
Other (Specify) _____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are not living with their parent(s):

25. a) Are your parents living?

Yes - both _____
Yes - father _____ (Go to question 25(b))
Yes - mother _____
No _____ (Go to question 30(a))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 30(a))

b) If Yes, why are you not living with your parents?

_____
_____

26. a) If parent(s) is/are living, did you see your parent(s) this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 27(b))
No _____ (Go to question 27(c))

b) If Yes, what kinds of things/activities did you do with your parents? (Probe - In parents' house/out of parents' house)

_____
_____

c) If No, why did you not see your parent(s) this last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

Difficulty with transportation _____
Live too far away _____
Other (Specify) _____

27. a) Did you speak to your parent(s) on the telephone this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 27(b))
No _____ (Go to question 27(c))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 28(a))

b) If Yes, how often did you speak to your parent(s) this last week? (Probe - How many times?)

Once _____
Twice _____
Three times _____
More than three times _____
Every day _____

Continuation of questions only for Ss who are not living with their parents:

c) If No, why did you not speak to your parent(s) on the telephone last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

No telephone _____
Don't know how to use telephone _____
Other (Specify) _____

28. a) Did someone where you live help you to do things this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 28(b))
No _____ (Go to question 28(c))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 29 (a))

b) If Yes,

Who helped? _____
How did they help? _____

c) If No,

What kind of help would you like?

_____

29. a) Would you like to change with whom/where you are now living?

Yes _____ (Go to question 29(b))
No _____ (Go to question 30(a))

b) If Yes, would you like to live-
(If S names a person/place, ask relationship or what place is and check off appropriate category)

In extended care facility (hospital) _____
With parents _____
Other relatives (Specify) _____
In a boarding/group home _____
With friends _____
With spouse (and children) _____
Alone _____
Other (Specify) _____

Questions 30 to 33 for all Ss.

30. a) Did you see your brothers/sisters, aunts/uncles, cousins or grandmother/grandfather this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 31(a))
No _____ (Go to question 32)
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 33(a))

31. a) If Yes, who did you see (Check all that apply)

b) How often? (Probe - How many times per week?

Use as Probes

(Brothers/sisters	_____	_____
(Aunts/uncles	_____	_____
(Cousins	_____	_____
(Grandmother/father	_____	_____

c) What kinds of things/activities did you do with your brothers/sisters (etc.)?

_____
_____

32. a) If No, why did you not see your brother/sister (etc). this last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

Difficulty with transportation _____
Live too far away _____
Other (Specify) _____

33. a) Did you speak to your brother/sister (etc.) on the telephone this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 33(b))
No _____ (Go to question 33(d))
Refused/cannot respond _____

b) If Yes, who did you speak to? (Check all that apply)

c) How often? (Probe - How many times per week?)

Brothers/sisters	_____	_____
Aunts/uncles	_____	_____
Cousins	_____	_____
Grandmother/father	_____	_____

d) If No, why did you not speak to your brothers/sisters (etc.) on the telephone this last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

No telephone _____
Don't know how to use telephone _____
Other (Specify) _____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are not married.

34. a) Do you have a boy/girl friend? (Probe - a special person that you like very much and that person likes you in the same way)

Yes-boy/girl friend _____ (Go to question 34(b))
No -boy/girl friend _____ (Go to question 38(a))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 38(a))

b) If Yes, how did you get to know your boy/girl friend? (Probe - School; live and/or work in the same place?)

_____

35. a) Did you see/spend any time with your boy/girl friend this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 35(b))
No _____ (Go to question 35(d))

b) If Yes, how often did you see/spend time with your boy/girl friend this last week? (Probe - How many times?)

_____

c) What did you and your boy/girl friend do/Where did you go this last week? (Probe - sporting activities, parties, dancing, etc.)

_____

d) If No, why did you not see/spend any time with your boy/girl friend this last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

Difficulty with transportation _____
Live too far away _____
Other (Specify) _____

Continuation of questions only for Ss who are not married.

36. a) Did you speak to your girl/boy friend on the telephone this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 36(b))
No _____ (Go to question 36(c))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 38(a))

b) If Yes, how often did you speak to your boy/girl friend this last week? (Probe - How many times?)

_____

c) If No, why did you not speak to your boy/girl friend on the telephone this last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

No telephone _____
Don't know how to use telephone _____
Other (Specify) _____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are married or living with someone.

37. a) How long have you been married/living with someone?

Less than 6 months	_____
6 months to 1 year	_____
2 to 3 years	_____
More than 3 years	_____
Refused/cannot respond	_____

b) How did you get to know your husband/wife-boy/girl friend?

_____

c) Do you have any children?

Yes _____
No _____

d) If Yes,

Number	Gender	Ages
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

This section to be answered by all Ss.

38. a) Do you have any (other) good friends? (Probe - friends other than your boy/girl friend?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 38(b))
No _____ (Go to question 41(a))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 42(a))

b) If Yes, where did you get to know them? (Probe - School, live and/or work in the same place)

_____

39. a) Did you see/spend any time with any of your good friends this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 39(b))
No _____ (Go to question 39(d))

b) If Yes, how often did you see/spend time with your good friends this last week? (Probe - How many times?)

_____

c) What did you and your good friends do/where did you go this last week? (Probe - sporting activities, parties, dancing, etc.)

_____

d) If No, why did you not see/spend any time with your good friends this last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

Difficulty with transportation _____
Live too far away _____
Other (Specify) _____

40. a) Did you speak to your good friends on the telephone this last week?

Yes _____ (Go to question 40(b))
No _____ (Go to question 40(c))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 41(a))

b) If Yes, how often did you speak to your good friends on the telephone this last week? (Probe - How many times?)"

_____

c) If No, why did you not speak to your good friends on the telephone this last week? (Probe - Can you give me some reasons?)

No telephone _____
Don't know how to use telephone _____
Other (Specify) _____

V VOCATIONAL ABILITY

This section to be answered by all Ss.

This section is about your job and the kinds of things you do each day at work.

41. a) Do you have a job now? (Probe - What do you do to earn money?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 41(b))
No _____ (Go to question 43(a))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 43(a))

b) If Yes, is this job: (Probe - Do you work every day/all day?

Full-time _____
Part-time _____

c) How long have you had this job? _____

d) Where do you work? (Probe - if name given, ask what kind of place?)

Workshop _____
Factory _____
Office _____
Store _____
Hospital _____
Other (Specify) _____

e) Name of the place you work at:

_____

(From the information determine whether this is-)
Competitive _____
Sheltered _____

f) What did you do at work yesterday? (Probe - What was your job? What did you do when you were working?)

_____
_____
_____
(Get brief description of job)

42. a) Did you work somewhere else before this job?

Yes _____ (Go to question 42(b))
No _____ (Go to question 42(g))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 45(a))

b) If Yes, was this job:
(Probe - Did you work every day/all day?)

Full-time _____
Part-time _____

c) How long did you have this job? _____

d) Where did you work? (Probe - if name given, ask what kind of place?

Workshop _____
Factory _____
Office _____
Store _____
Hospital _____
Other (Specify) _____

e) Name of place you worked at:

_____

(From information determine whether this is-)

Competitive _____
Sheltered _____

f) What did you do at work? (Probe - What was your job?)

_____
_____
_____
(Get brief description of job)

g) If No, what were you doing instead of working?

School _____
Unemployed _____
Other (Specify) _____

The questions in this box are only for Ss who are not presently working.

43. a) Have you every worked before? (Probe - Did you ever have a job to earn money?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 43(b))
No _____ (Go to question 43(g))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Go to question 44(a))

b) If Yes, was this job:
(Probe - Did you work every day/all day?)

Full-time _____
Part-time _____

c) How long did you have this job? _____

d) Where did you work? (Probe - if name given, ask what kind of place?)

Workshop _____
Factory _____
Office _____
Store _____
Hospital _____
Other (Specify) _____

e) Name of place you worked at:

_____
(From information determine whether this was:)

Competitive _____
Sheltered _____

f) What did you do at work? (Probe - What was your job?)

_____
_____
_____
(Get brief description of job)

Continuation of questions only for Ss who are not presently working.

g) If No, what were you doing instead of working?

School _____
Unemployed _____
Other (Specify) _____

44. a) Are you looking for work now?

Yes _____ (Go to question 44(b))
No _____ (Go to question 44(c))
Refused/cannot respond _____

b) If Yes, how long have you been looking for work?

_____

c) If No, what are you doing instead of looking for work?

_____

VI Educational Status

This section to be answered by all Ss.

45. a) Are you now enrolled in/attending any adult school programmes? (Probe - Are you going to school after work/during the day?)

Yes _____ (Go to question 46(a))
No _____ (Go to question 47(a))
Refused/cannot respond _____ (Finish)

46. a) If Yes, where are you going to school?

_____

b) What kinds of things are you learning?

_____

c) Have you attended an adult school programme before?

Yes _____ Where? _____

What kinds of things did you learn?

_____

No _____ Why not? _____

47. a) If No, would you like to go to an adult school programme?

Yes _____
No _____ Why not? _____

b) Have you ever attended an adult school programme?

Yes _____ Where? _____

What kinds of things did you learn?

_____

No _____ Why not? _____

To be filled out by the interviewer at the end of the interview.

Date of Interview _____

Duration of Interview _____

Interviewer _____

APPENDIX D

LETTERS AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS SENT TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND ASSOCIATIONS FOR THE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
2125 MAIN MALL
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS
VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA
V6T 1Z5

Department of Educational Psychology
and Special Education
Scarfe Annex, Room 19
October 13, 1981

I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education at the University of British Columbia, where I am working on my master's thesis under the supervision of Dr. Peggy Koopman.

My thesis is a survey of the community adjustment of moderately retarded adults after leaving school. It has received the approval of the University of British Columbia Behavioural Sciences Screening Committee for Research and Other Studies Involving Human Subjects (see letter attached).

I am writing to request your assistance in identifying men and women who graduated from schools or programmes for the moderately retarded in your school district in June, 1980 and 1978.

Enclosed please find an outline detailing the purposes and methodology of my research project.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 228-6219 (U.B.C.), or 874-8684 (Home).

Thank you for your kind consideration and co-operation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Marvin I. Enkin
Master's Candidate

Peggy Koopman, Ed.D.
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
2125 MAIN MALL
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS
VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA
V6T 1Z5

Department of Educational Psychology
and Special Education
Scarfe Annex, Room 19
October 13, 1981

I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education at the University of British Columbia, where I am working on my master's thesis under the supervision of Dr. Peggy Koopman.

My thesis is a survey of the community adjustment of moderately retarded adults after leaving school. It has received the approval of the University of British Columbia Behavioural Sciences Screening Committee for Research and Other Studies Involving Human Subjects (see letter attached).

I am writing to request both your endorsement of my research project and your assistance in identifying men and women who graduated from schools or programmes for the moderately retarded in your school district in June, 1980 and 1978 and who are now under your supervision in workshops, residences and social programmes.

Enclosed please find an outline detailing the purposes and methodology of my research project.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 228-6219 (U.B.C.), or 874-8684 (Home).

Thank you for your kind consideration and co-operation in this matter.

Sincerely,

Marvin I. Enkin
Master's Candidate

Peggy Koopman, Ed.D.
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
2125 MAIN MALL
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS
VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA
V6T 1Z5

THESIS OUTLINE

I Title: A Survey of Moderately Retarded Adults in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia: Their Community Adjustment One and Three Years After Graduating From School.

II Purposes:

1. To describe the current status of moderately retarded adults living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia one and three years after leaving school in terms of their mobility independence, self-sufficiency, interaction level, and vocational and educational status.

As part of the object the research will more specifically dtermine:
a) If differences exist between the adjustment of males and females on each of the four variables.
b) If differences exist among the four variables with regard to length of time after leaving school.
c) If differences exist between the adjustment of males and females on each of the four variables with regard to the length of time after leaving school.

III Subjects:

There will be approximately 40 subjects in this study. The subjects will be male and female graduates of schools and programmes designated for the moderately retarded living in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia. They will have graduated from school in June, 1980 and 1978.

IV Methodology:

In preparation for the collection of the data, all subjects in the study will be contacted with the appropriate agency's (school boards and associations for the mentall retarded) approval. Before the actual interview takes place, informed consent will also be obtained (see sheets attached).

The basis for data collection with be a semi-formal structured personal interview (see interview-prompt recording sheet attached) with each of the adults. The interviewing will be done by the principal investigator. The interview will be approximately 1 hour and will take place in one session at the residence of each adult. A

parent, relative, or other appropriate individual will be present at the time of the interview. This is to ensure both accuracy of information and security of the handicapped adult. The interviews will be taped to make sure all data is recorded accurately. All tapes will be erased once the information has been transferred to coding sheets.

All information will be kept strictly confidential and no information on any individual will be released. To this end all subjects will be identified only by a code number.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
312 - 6344 MEMORIAL ROAD
VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA
V6T 1W5

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION
Telephone [604]228-3652

Our File:
Your File:

80-11-03

Dr. P. Koopman
Faculty of Education,
Scarfe.

RE: Your proposed study: A survey of moderately retarded adults in the Lower Mainland of B.C.: Their community adjustment one, three and five years after leaving school.

Dear Dr. Koopman:

The Behavioural Sciences Screening Committee for Research & Other Studies Involving Human Subjects has reviewed the protocol for your proposed study. The Committee has approved the ethical acceptability of the experimental procedures to be followed.

Upon receipt of written approval from each of the cooperating agencies in your study, your Certificate of Approval will be released to you after which Mr. Enkin may begin his data collection.

If you wish additional information concerning the Committee's requirements, you may reach me at local 4985 or 5351.

Sincerely,

W. Todd Rogers, Acting Chairman,
UBC Screening Committee for Research
& Other Studies Involving Human Subjects
-- Behavioural Sciences.

WTR:lpc
c. Dr. RD. Spratley
Dr. L. Walters

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
2125 MAIN MALL
VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA
V6T 1Z5

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Dear School Graduate and Parents/Guardians:

_____ School has agreed to participate in a research project looking at what former students are doing in the community after they leave school. The research is being undertaken to fulfill the requirements for a master's degree in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education at the University of British Columbia.

The project requires the co-operation of graduates from the school in 1978 and 1980 to be interviewed for about one hour in their homes. During the interview each graduate will be asked questions about his/her mobility independence, self-sufficiency skills, interaction level, and vocational and educational status. The interview will be tape recorded but all tapes will be erased at the university once the information has been transferred to computer coding sheets at the university.

The main benefit from the project will be a better understanding of what former students are doing in the community after they leave shcool. This kind of information is of interest to all those concerned with the progress and development of these former students.

In order to carry out this project, the consent of the school graduate and his/her parents is required. Please find enclosed two consent forms to be filled out by the school graduate and his/her parent or guardian. Please return the consent forms to the university as soon as possible in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

We wish to emphasize that all names and answers will be kept strictly confidential. Only group data will be reported. It is also important to realize that participation in this project is voluntary and that withdrawal from the project is possible at anytime. We would, however, greatly appreciate your consent to take part in this research.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 228-6219 (U.B.C.) or 874-8684 (Home).

Thank you for your kind co-operation.

Sincerely,

Marvin I. Enkin
Master's Candidate

P. R. Koopman, Ed.D.
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

APPENDIX E

LETTERS AND CONSENT FORMS SENT TO SUBJECTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
2125 MAIN MALL
VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA
V6T 1Z5

FACULTY OF EDUCATION

Dear School Graduate and Parents/Guardians:

_____ School has agreed to participate in a research project looking at what former students are doing in the community after they leave school. The research is being undertaken to fulfill the requirements for a master's degree in the Department of Educational Psychology and Special Education at the University of British Columbia.

The project requires the co-operation of graduates from the school in 1978 and 1980 to be interviewed for about one hour in their homes. During the interview each graduate will be asked questions about his/her mobility independence, self-sufficiency skills, interaction level, and vocational and educational status. The interview will be tape recorded but all tapes will be erased at the university once the information has been transferred to computer coding sheets at the university.

The main benefit from the project will be a better understanding of what former students are doing in the community after they leave shcool. This kind of information is of interest to all those concerned with the progress and development of these former students.

In order to carry out this project, the consent of the school graduate and his/her parents is required. Please find enclosed two consent forms to be filled out by the school graduate and his/her parent or guardian. Please return the consent forms to the university as soon as possible in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

We wish to emphasize that all names and answers will be kept strictly confidential. Only group data will be reported. It is also important to realize that participation in this project is voluntary and that withdrawal from the project is possible at anytime. We would, however, greatly appreciate your consent to take part in this research.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at 228-6219 (U.B.C.) or 874-8684 (Home).

Thank you for your kind co-operation.

Sincerely,

Marvin I. Enkin
Master's Candidate

P. R. Koopman, Ed.D.
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

PARENT/GUARDIAN CONSENT FORM

I consent to _____'s participation in the study of graduates of _____ School. I understand that this will involve one interview of approximately one hour. I also understand the interview will be taped and the tape will be erased once the data has been transferred to computer coding sheets at the University.

This information will be kept strictly confidential and no information on individuals will be released. I also understand that participation in this project is voluntary and may be terminated at any time.

_____

Signature of Parent/Guardian

I am unwilling to have _____ participate in this study.

_____

Signature of Parent/Guardian

SUBJECT CONSENT FORM

I agree to take part in the study of people who left _____ School.

I know the interview will last about one hour and will be tape recorded. I also know the tape will be erased at the University.

I understand I can stop answering questions anytime I want to.

_____

Your Name

I do not want to answer any questions.

_____

Your Name

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
FACULTY OF EDUCATION
2125 MAIN MALL
UNIVERSITY CAMPUS
VANCOUVER, B.C., CANADA
V6T 1Z5

Department of Educational Psychology
and Special Education
Scarfe Annex, Room 19

Dear School Graduate and Parents/Guardians:

Three weeks ago I mailed to you a request to participate in a study on the graduates of _____ School. This is just a reminder to ask your help in completing and returning the consent form to the University. If you have already done so, thank you. If not, your participation is needed to help find out what former students are doing in the community after they leave school. If you did not receive the consent forms and would like to participate in the study, please do not hesitate to call me at 228-6219 (U.B.C.), or 874-8684 (Home).

Thank youfor your kind co-operation.

Sincerely,

Marvin I. Enkin
Master's Candidate

P.R. Koopman, Ed.D.
Chairperson, Thesis Committee

APPENDIX F

CODING OF RESPONSES

Coding of Responses

The following is a description of the procedures used to code the data from the interview-prompt recording sheet for the three types of questions.

Forced-Choice Response

The responses for the forced-choice response questions were coded as follows:

1 = Yes

2 = No

In questions where there were more than the two choices available, the possible responses were numbered sequentially, e.g.:

a) Where do you live/Who do you live with?
1 = In extended care facility (hospital)
2 = With parents
3 = Other relatives (specify)
4 = In a boarding/group home
5 = With friends
6 = With spouse (and children)
7 = Alone
8 = Other (specify)

b) Which city/town do you live in now?
01 = Burnaby
02 = Coquitlam
03 = Delta
04 = Langley
05 = New Westminster
06 = North Vancouver
07 = Port Coquitlam
08 = Port Moody
09 = Richmond
10 = Surrey
11 = Vancouver
12 = West Vancouver
13 = White Rock
14 = Other (specify)

Multiple Choice (More than One Response)

In this type of question there was more than one response permitted and often required in these questions. The responses were coded with reference to the number of times per week a subject did something, e.g.:

a) If Yes, Which meals did you make? How Often?

The name of the meal was coded with the frequency.

Code
1 = Once per week
2 = Twice per week
3 = Three times per week
4 = More than three times per week
5 = Every day

Open-End Response

The different responses to open-ended questions were tallied. Using this method similar responses were grouped to form a category. A category number was then assigned to each of the responses contained therein, e.g.:

8 e) Where did you go on a B.C. Hydro bus this last week?

Code	Category	Responses
1	Work	workshop, work
2	Recreation/Social	bowling, swimming, bingo, visiting friends, movie, hockey game, party, ice skating
3	Religion	church, Sunday School, Bible study
4	Shopping	clothes, food, presents, Christmas tree
5	Health & Beauty	haircut, hairdresser
6	Restaurant	eating out, MacDonald's, White Spot
7	Education	school
8	Home	home (place where subject lived)

The categories and their codes as well as a sample of the response in each of the categories for Questions 10(d) and 41(f) are presented here to assist the reader in understanding the

analysis of the data for these specific questions.

10 d) What kinds of things did you cook for?

Breakfast _____
Lunch _____
Supper _____
Snack _____

Code	Category	Response
1 =	No Cooking - no use of pots, knife, fork, spoon.	Make a sandwick, mix chocolate milk, corn flakes, fruit, cheese and crackers.
2 =	Basic Cooking - use of pots and stove; baking, frying.	Make soup, tea, macaroni, eggs, pancakes, bacon
3 =	Elaborate Cooking - use of stove to make more than one thing; 2-3 course meal.	Salad; meat - chicken, hamburger, pork chops, chili; vegetables - potatoes, brussel sprouts, corn; dessert - cake, cookies, pudding.

41 f) What did you do at work yesterday?

This question was used to identify the skill level the subjects were working out. Their job description was categorized into one out of five skill levels defined in the Vocational Check List of the Adaptive Functioning Index (Marlett, 1973).

Code	Category	Responses
1 =	Skill Level 1 One step task, with few decisions and/or gross dexterity (e.g., one task on assembly line, wiping tables, peeling potatoes).	packages, nails, fold napkins, sort B.C. Tel parts, stuff letters.
2 =	Skill Level 2 Simple routines, with few decisions and/or gross dexterity (e.g., two or more step packaging, basic janitorial skills).	clean up shop, make pompoms, count nails/ screws/buttons and put in bag.
3 =	Skill Level 3 Tasks requiring judgment or exacting precision (e.g., spot welding, set-up work, precision assembly).	hammer flats together, operate dishwasher, assemble TV converters, transplant or water seedlings, put lamps together.
4 =	Skill Level 4 Complex routines requiring judgment and high skill, within an established routine (e.g., quality control, stock control, lead hand).	--
5 =	Skill Level 5 Complex routines requiring judgment, high skill, flexibility, and an ability to make decisions on his/her own (e.g., pay clerk, work foreman).	--